DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 697 IR 050 351

AUTHOR Colson, John Calvin
TITLE Academic Ambitions and Library Development: The American Bureau of Industrial Research and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1904-18. Occasional Paper Number 159.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Graduate School of Library and Information Science.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 56p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Development; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Library Acquisition; Library Administration; *Library Collections; Library Role; *Research Libraries; *Special Libraries; *Unions; *United States History
IDENTIFIERS American Bureau of Industrial Research; *State Historical Societies; University of Wisconsin; *Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

Intended to contribute to a better understanding of research library development in the United States, this report describes the history of the development of the library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin from 1904 to 1918. It is based on records of the relationships between three principals--John R. Commons and Richard T. Ely (members of the University of Wisconsin faculty) and Reuben Gold Thwaites (superintendent of the Society)--and their associates and subordinates at the two institutions. From a rich mixture of personal ambitions, institutional and personal interactions, variant perceptions of the functions of libraries, and other factors, the library of the Society was developed during the period 1904 to 1913 into--among other things--a major center for the study of the trade union movement in the United States. The development of the library resulted from the working of a complex collecting effort by an agency--the American Bureau of Industrial Research--connected administratively to neither the Society nor the University. Afterward, the Society continued the collecting program begun by the Bureau, but in a substantial degree of dissociation from the conditions that led to the library's earlier development. The author's vita and numerous references are included in this report. (Author/ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232697

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Academic Ambitions and Library Development:

The American Bureau of Industrial Research and The State Historical Society of Wisconsin 1904-18

by

John Calvin Colson

University of Illinois
Graduate School of Library and Information Science

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

ISSN 0276 1769

Number 159
May 1983

IR050351

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl Plested

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© 1983 The Board of Trustees of The University of Illinois

Contents

Introduction 3
The State Historical Society of Wisconsin 1846-1900 4
Richard T. Ely and the Origins of the American Bureau of Industrial Research 5
The Establishment of the American Bureau of Industrial Research 10
Operations of the Bureau 1904-08 13
Bureau—Society Relations 1904-13 25
Epilogue 37
References 43
Additional Reference 52
Vita 53

INTRODUCTION

Libraries do not grow. Growth is a function of organisms and it occurs naturally, unconsciously, guided by genetic control systems. In libraries, on the other hand, increase has been the common condition of their development, especially increase in the numbers and diversity of materials held in them. It has been a process controlled by human will, and, almost invariably, one in which the wills of two or more people were involved. That is, library increase has been a social process.

At a given time any library is a result of human interaction to a more or less common and specific purpose. Nevertheless, those persons involved in the development of a library may have—will have, usually—variant purposes which stem from variant perceptions of the idea of a library. A library resulting from the convergence of such purposes does not develop in the coherent, orderly manner which would characterize properly "library growth." Indeed, the misinterpretation of mere increase as growth may prove dysfunctional in the development of a library.

This report is based on study of the records of the relationships between three principals—John R. Commons, Richard T. Ely, Reuben Gold Thwaites—and their associates and subordinates in a complex process which involved also two dissimilar institutions—the University of Wisconsin and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. From a rich mixture of personal ambitions, institutional and personal interactions, variant perceptions of the functions of libraries, and other factors, the library of the State Historical Society was developed during the period 1904-13 into—among other things—a major center for the study of the trade union movement in the United States. The development of the library resulted from the working of a complex collecting effort by an agency—the American Bureau of Industrial Research—connected administratively to neither the Society nor the University. Afterward, the Society continued the collecting program begun by the Bureau, but in a substantial degree of dissociation from the conditions that led to the library's development during 1904-13.

None of the principals involved ever attempted to tell the story of that effort, and the records of their involvement are not as comprehensive as is desirable. Indeed, there is almost no record of policy development. But much can be inferred from a significant body of operational records relevant to the collaboration between the Bureau and the Society, for the records afford more than a glimpse into a fascinating period in the development of American scholarship. To the extent that the events of that

period contributed to the development of scholarly tradition in America—and many of our ideas about the subject appear to be rooted in that vaguely bounded field—this study may contribute to a better understanding of research library development in the United States.

THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN 1846-1900

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, founded in 1846, was established with a broad mandate for development; one clearly in accord with the "manifest destiny" concept fostered so ardently by the Jacksonians, whose ideals and spirit dominated the "golden age" of American democracy from 1830 to 1860—i.e., to preserve for all time the record of the achievements of the pioneers.[1] The first two superintendents of the Society, Lyman C. Draper (1854-86) and Reuben Gold Thwaites (1887-1913) were enterprising collectors who interpreted the mandate even more broadly than the founders, so that by 1900 the Society's library was one of the eminent research libraries in the nation, and certainly the outstanding general library in the Midwest. Its collections amounted to more than 200,000 titles (not including government publications), an exemplary newspaper collection, and a distinguished collection of manuscripts.[2] There is ground for proposing that the Society's library was a major factor in the development of the University of Wisconsin into the front rank of American universities. Draper set the tone of the Society's development for decades beyond his term with it; his ideas remained a pervasive influence at the Society at least until the end of the 1960s. Draper, however, operated in the tradition of the gentleman/scholar, with many of the dilettantish attributes associated with the concept. Thwaites, chosen by Draper for his succession, appears to have begun his superintendency in the same tradition. However, by 1900 he was responding to the developing *Gestalt* (not to say *Zeitgeist*) psychology of the new American university, or, at least, to that model represented by the University of Wisconsin. The most dramatic symbol of the change was the relocation of the Society's headquarters and library in 1900, from the state capitol to its own building adjacent to the campus—a building which it shared with the 55,000 volume collection of the recently established (1885) University library.[4] Since then the Society changed the scope of its collecting programs in the library on three occasions, partly in response to the increasing numbers and prices of historical works after 1900, partly to accommodate the collecting programs of the University library, and partly in response to changes in the concept of knowledge itself after 1876.[5] This paper is about the latter sort of change, as its workings may be seen from the records of the Society and the American Bureau of Industrial Research, a portion of the University faculty, and

private contributors to both. The principals involved were Thwaites and two members of the University faculty, Richard T. Ely (1854-1943) and John R. Commons (1862-1945).

RICHARD T. ELY AND THE ORIGINS OF THE AMERICAN BUREAU OF INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Prior to about 1860 there was little difference between the American university and the so-called liberal arts college. The Morrill Act of 1862 (the Land Grant College Act) may have had the greatest long-term effect on the development of the university in America, but in the years 1876 to 1920 the most apparent change in American universities was a seemingly startling shift from a principal emphasis on general education for undergraduates to a research-oriented graduate study leading to a doctorate degree. The change had been developing since the 1820s, influenced strongly by such men as George Ticknor and others who earned their doctorates in German universities. In 1876 this slow development was dramatically symbolized by the establishment of Johns Hopkins University strictly as a graduate institution. But the depth of the change was demonstrated best by the rapid development of graduate schools in America's state universities, especially in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin, and California. In Wisconsin, in turn, such development had a profound effect on the State Historical Society.

Richard Ely received his Ph.D. at Heidelberg in 1979, where he studied under Gustav Schmoller, one of the leaders of the German school of historical economics. In 1881 Ely joined the economics faculty at Johns Hopkins, where he became a leader of the younger economists in their dissent from the austere academicism of the classical school. He was one of the founders of the American Economic Association in 1885, its secretary (1885-92) and president (1900-01). Born a Presbyterian, he later became an Episcopalian, a leading academic advocate of the "social gospel," a founder of the Episcopalian Christian Social Union and its secretary from 1891 to 1894. In 1894, Ely described himself as an "aristocrat rather than a democrat," with a firm belief that the working classes must accept leadership from an elite of intellect and achievement. His practical adherence to Progressivism only tempered his elitism.[6]

Ely's education and ideas about economics, coupled with his religious outlook on social issues, led him to an investigation of trade unions in America, which in the 1880s was an unorthodox interest for economists. In 1885 his findings were published in *The Labor Movement in America*, a

work he called later, a "sketch."[7] In a second edition published in 1886, Ely made public his awareness of the earlier work's inadequacies and also made aware the germ of his idea for the American Bureau of Industrial Research. He asserted: "In a field so new and so immense, it is but natural to suppose that I must occasionally have fallen into errors both of omission and commission...," and that he would look favorably upon any "friendly reader" who would bring them to his notice. Also, he requested contributions of materials from or about the labor movement "as well as for any oral or written communication bearing thereon."[8]

During the next decade Ely accumulated an extensive collection of such materials, but any plans for an enlarged edition of his "sketch" were put off by other commitments. Possibly the greatest obstacle came from his move to the University of Wisconsin in 1892, where he was appointed director of the new School of Economics, Political Science and History. His administrative duties, his activities in a variety of associations and his increasing involvement in the national and Wisconsin Progressive Movements must have diluted his capacity for renewal of the study of labor in America, although the project apparently never was long out of his mind.[9] He continued to develop his own collection of materials so that in 1902 it was composed of 4000 volumes, including 600 bound volumes of labor periodicals and about 4000 pamphlets.[10] In 1894-95, Ely placed the collection on deposit at the State Historical Society.[11] About the same time, he began making gifts of materials on labor and other topics to the Society during the period 1894-1910. These amounted to a total of 520 books, 2778 pamphlets and an uncounted number of unbound serials.[12] During the same period he was also encouraging other collectors, such as Joseph Labadie, to give to the Society "labor literature of any sort or description...." He told Labadie, "I hope..., someday, to revise my 'Labor Movement in America,' and make it a history of the labor movement. Should I, however, never succeed in carrying out my hopes, the material will be preserved for someone else."[13]

Some concatentation of events raised in Ely's mind a specter of despair, for, apparently abruptly, in October 1902 he gave notice to Thwaites that he intended to withdraw the collection deposited at the Society, and sell it to the John Crerar Library in Chicago.[14] The reasons for the sale are not clear. Thwaites's explanation to the Society was that Ely:

> had been led to this decision by consideration of the fact that Chicago is a great industrial center whither it is natural that students of social and labor problems should resort; and that the John Crerar Library, in the scheme of differentiation which now exists between Chicago libraries, concluded to expend considerable sums of money in the accumulation of books and journals related to the labor movement....[15]

Clifford Lord has written that the Society lost the collection because it was unable to meet Ely's price, a reason hinted at by Thwaites.[16] Benjamin Rader wrote that Ely had severe financial problems in 1901-02, owing to his wife's extended illness and an accident which caused their son to lose an arm. Acutely in need of money, "he finally decided to sacrifice his magnificent collection...." Ely offered it first to the Library of Congress, and then to the Crerar Library, which paid $12,500 for it.[17] In virtually the next sentence, however, Rader stated the sale "allowed Ely to begin an active career in real estate." In accord with the statement by Thwaites, one may speculate that Ely was aware of the University of Chicago's aggressive interest in the social sciences, and may have concluded that the collection would be used better in that city. Whatever the causes, in November 1902 the collection was transferred to the Crerar Library which, owing to space limitations, placed it in rented storage in quarters at the Newberry Library until the Crerar Trustees could decide what to do with it.[18]

The sale of the collection, and the circumstances attendant to it, illustrate the complexities and contradictions in American scholarship about the turn of the twentieth century. In developing a personal research collection of such extent, Ely was following the custom of German and American academicians. Up to about 1870, the university libraries at Berlin, Göttingen, Harvard, and Yale were relatively small, general collections, with specialized research collections being, for the most part, the property of individual professors.[19] Even the sale of the collection, prompted by economic hardship, to a library was in the Germanic-American tradition although the folklore of library development is that most such collections were sold by impoverished widows. On the other hand, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, which lost an important collection by the sale, was an agency founded squarely in the Anglo-American tradition symbolized by the Royal Society of Antiquaries and the Massachusetts Historical Society, both societies of gentleman scholars, whose members tended to have less precisely focused research interests than those of the new professoriat. The Wisconsin Historical Society had been institutionalized by its state subsidy, however minimal, and its location in the capitol. Even so, under the influence of its curators (the governing board), and especially of Draper and Thwaites, it had remained basically in that Anglo-American tradition until 1889, when Thwaites began to push for a new building for the Society constructed with state funds, but separate from the capitol.[20] The splendid new quarters—opened in 1900—would not have been attained without University support.[21]

The new building symbolized nicely a major change in American scholarship and librarianship. The semiautonomous universities and their librar-

ies, blending English and German traditions into one which was entirely American, were now the principal centers of intellectual development in the Old Northwest, with their companies of professors and platoons of librarians operating as the armies of the light. This cavalry of professors (e.g., Richard T. Ely and John R. Commons) and their librarian quartermasters (e.g., Reuben Gold Thwaites and Charles McCarthy) were major forces in the Progressive Movement. The professors' fields were in the new academic disciplines: economics, history, sociology, the agricultural sciences, and engineering. At Wisconsin they included such men as Ely and Commons in economics, Frederick Jackson Turner in history and Eward A. Ross in sociology. Their weapons were facts, discovered and assembled in their base camps—i.e., the libraries. The libraries themselves were massive with new collections of the new materials spawned by technical developments in printing (e.g., the linotype and mimeograph were invented in 1885) such as journals, research reports, statistical compilations. and others. There was even a new academic discipline—"library science"—intended to permit the imposition of coherence on the materials pouring into the libraries.[22] Lyman Draper and Reuben Thwaites, in the catholicity of their collecting, had built just the kinds of collections so necessary to the new professoriat. And, in a great irony, it was almost at the same time that the Society was moved to the campus and Ely sold his labor collection.

The record does not disclose whether Ely was aware of the irony, but it is certain that the sale of his collection was not the end of his ambition for a history of the labor movement. He was not to achieve it himself, but he was the architect of this accomplishment. His gifts to the Society continued, and the Society responded with an increase of their own collecting efforts on the subject. They were, however, minimal, owing to severe limits on their funds for staff and materials. They were compelled, as Ely's letter to Labadie indicates, to rely on gifts from interested parties.[23] The Society's acquisitions budget, until after World War I, never amounted to more than $5,000 a year. Two set of events, apparently unconnected, worked to make possible a program for the achievement of Ely's desire. The first was related to the Society's move to a new building.

Since 1854 the Society has been a trustee of the state—an autonomous membership association strongly dependent upon state appropriations for achievement of its various missions. The governing body has been the Board of Curators, of which 32 are elected by the membership and 4 are *ex officio*—the governor, the speaker of the assembly, the president of the University, and the state superintendent of public instruction. By the 1890s, executive authority over the Society's operations and much author-

ity over policy development was vested in the person of the secretary (later, the superintendent), Reuben Gold Thwaites. Generally, he ran the Society, with the board tending to ratify policy decisions made by him in consultation with its executive committee. Thwaites, rather than the executive committee, initiated policy development, and, by the 1890s, as it is apparent, the University's faculty were exercising an increasing influence on the acts and policies of Thwaites.

The development of that influence is, for the most part, unrecorded (his home was in a faculty neighborhood), but there are indicators. After his selection as assistant secretary in 1885, he established rapport with the younger scholars at the University. By the early 1890s, Turner was conducting his doctoral seminar in the Society's quarters in the capitol; thus the Society library was a necessary resource for the research-oriented members of the faculty.[24] Its rooms in the capitol, never adequate, were desperately crowded, even with a substantial portion of the collection in storage and Thwaites's pleadings for a building verging on the frantic. The University also had urgent demands for a new library building, and President Charles Kendall Adams also believed that the Society's library should be on or close to the campus. So, by 1893 they made a deal that the University regents would give land for the Society's building and otherwise support the Society's quest for building funds while the Society would move to the campus and share the building with the University library. Construction began in 1898 so that the building was occupied in 1900.[25] There was some grumbling among the curators, jealous of the Society's autonomy, but it was silenced by the fire which destroyed the capitol in 1904. Had Thwaites not assented to the University's building proposal, the Society's library would have gone with the flames.

For several years before the building deal was made, individual members of the faculty were having a strong influence on the acquisitions policies of the Society.[26] By 1895 there was a fair degree of consultation between Thwaites, Isaac Bradley (the nominal librarian of the Society), and their counterparts in the University. After acceptance of the proposal for the new building, such consultation became more intensive, and by 1898 it was apparent that it must be formalized. A committee of representatives from the Society and the University were appointed to refine and ratify the policy which Thwaites called "differentiation in purchases."[27] An agreement on the division of fields of collecting was adopted in 1901. University library collections were to include science, technology, philosophy, philology, education, fine arts, and belles lettres (except for Shakespeare and Old English drama). The Society's collections were to include history, genealogy, travel and description, economics, sociology, newspapers,

Shakespeare and Old English drama, biography, bibliography, and periodicals were to be divided, with the Society collecting American and general materials, and the University collecting foreign and technical materials. Detailed definitions of these topics were specified later in 1901.[28] The agreement remains in effect, although much revised, and with each revision there has been a resultant narrowing in the scope of the Society's collections.[29]

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AMERICAN BUREAU OF INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Broadly, this was the library situation at the time Ely sold his collection. Whatever disappointments and misfortunes led him to the sale, he was soon confronted with an unprecedented opportunity to realize a much expanded version of his *Labor Movement in America*. The opportunity arrived in a letter from John R. Commons, then on the staff of *The Economic Year Book*, published in Washington, D.C. Commons had been one of Ely's students at Johns Hopkins, 1888-90. For the next 12 years he had a peripatetic career in economics—teaching at Oberlin College, Indiana University and Syracuse University, and serving on the staffs of the U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Industrial Commission, and National Civic Federation. In 1902 he was employed by William English Walling for *The Economic Year Book*, and became acquainted with Colonel Carroll D. Wright, president of Clark College (Worcester, Massachusetts) and chairman of the Carnegie Institution, Department of Economics and Sociology (Washington, D.C.).[30] Wright told Commons that the Carnegie Institution had some interest in subsidizing study of economic development in the United States, and Commons mentioned to Wright the desire by Ely to revise his book the *Labor Movement in America*. Wright expressed interest and Commons wrote immediately to Ely to suggest "some plan of cooperation with the Carnegie Institution...."[31] Ely seized the opportunity, and within a month sent Wright a proposal asking for a grant of $10,000 a year for three years, to enable Ely to hire three "investigators."[32] Commons, in his letter, had told Ely also, "I would like to get an appointment for work of that kind, if possible." So began a stormy, fruitful collaboration which was to have significant effect on two important Wisconsin institutions, and which would enrich Americans' understanding of the role of organized labor in America.

Ely's proposal to the Carnegie Institution miscarried. Colonel Wright endorsed it, as did his associates in the department, professors John B. Clark of Columbia University and Henry Farnam of Yale.[33] It appears,

though, that they were committed also to similar work under the direction of Professor J.H. Hollander at Johns Hopkins.[34] A year later Ely told Commons he still had no formal response from the Carnegie Institution, and believed that Hollander would receive the grant. By then (June 1903) Ely had begun to seek other funds for what he still described as an "exhaustive history" of the "labor movement," and he told Commons, "I want to make you Professor of Sociology in the University of Wisconsin."[35] Soon, with the assistance of another friend of Commons, Robert Hunter of New York City, Ely's fund-raising efforts began to succeed. By December 1903 he had received $10,000 from Valentine Everit Macy of New York City, and was negotiating for a like amount from Stanley McCormick of Chicago.[36] Ely was confident enough of success that he talked with University president, Charles R. Van Hise on 15 December 1903 and gained assent to the appointment of Commons as professor of political economy at a salary of $3,000 a year, "a high salary for Wisconsin." University funds were to provide $1,000 and $2,000 were to be raised by Ely. Commons was to teach only one semester a year, "along labor lines, so that it would help in the investigations and in the preparation of the book."[37]

It is curious that Ely's statements of his plans at this time did not involve the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. On 14 December 1903 he wrote Hunter that he thought he could "count on the cooperation of the University of Wisconsin and also of the Crerar Library." Subsequently, Ely wrote that his original intention had been for much of the work to be done in New York.[38] Ely's plan was to have the research completed in 1907, and the history ready for publication by 1 October 1909.[39] In any event, in the spring of 1904 Ely's plans flowered, for he had secured $30,000 in contributions, and Commons was appointed professor at Wisconsin. The plans also were being expanded by either Ely or Commons. By April 1904, the American Bureau of Industrial Research was organized, "for the scientific investigation of economic and industrial problems of the United States," work of much broader scope than a history of the labor movement, although that was intended still to be the first effort of the Bureau, a multi-volume work to be called, "The History of Industrial Democracy in America."[40] Now the State Historical Society of Wisconsin was involved, although a significant part of the work still was to be done in Chicago:

> The John Crerar Library of Chicago, where a considerable part of the work will be done, has already purchased large collections of economic literature, and its further cooperation is promised. We also expect the cooperation of the Wisconsin Historical Library. These libraries are fortunate in having as librarians men like Clement W. Andrews and Reuben Gold Thwaites, whose delight it is to serve scholars.[41]

The State Historical Society's cooperation already was in effect, for sometime in the spring of 1904 the American Bureau of Industrial Research's quarters were established in room 118 of the Society.[42]

The Bureau was organized indifferently. Its directors were Ely and Commons. There was neither president nor secretary. Valentine Macy was treasurer and, apparently, chairman of a "financial committee."[43] No administrative officers of the University, the Society, nor the Crerar Library had formal attachment to the Bureau. There was an advisory board, or committee, which was originally intended to include ten persons, but which seems never to have had more than three—John B. Clark, Henry Farnam and Albert Shaw, editor of the *Review of Reviews*.[44] Shaw, who seems to have been significant in persuading Stanley McCormick to contribute to the Bureau, had suggested the advisory committee to McCormick, who then insisted on it as a precondition to his contribution. Shaw, apparently thinking in terms of the original proposal for a one volume history of labor, had suggested that the committee's function would be to review the manuscript before publication.[45] Ely, on the other hand, saw no clear role for the committee, which he called the "committee of ten." As events turned out, the committee performed no significant function in the work of the Bureau. Neither was the Bureau's structure significant to its operations. Those were executed chiefly by Commons and the "collaborators" on the Bureau staff—John B. Andrews, Ulrich B. Phillips, Helen L. Sumner, and other faculty and graduate students at the University of Wisconsin.[46]

The work of the Bureau was financed almost entirely through contributions, although in one optimistic moment Ely did write that any royalties from the proposed history would be turned over to the Bureau's finance committee.[47] The original $30,000 was contributed by Macy ($10,000), McCormick ($10,000), Robert Fulton Cutting of New York City, Justice P. Henry Dugro of New York City, and Ellison A. Smyth of South Carolina ($1,500).[48] Ultimately, about $75,000 were spent by the Bureau.[49] Other contributors included Charles Richard Crane of Chicago, William Bayard Cutting of New York City, Robert Hunter of New York City, William English Walling of Washington, D.C. ($1,250), and the Carnegie Institution, on recommendation by Colonel Wright ($1,500).[50] According to the Arthur H. Clark Company, "students" also contributed to the Bureau.[51]

OPERATIONS OF THE BUREAU 1904-08

The work of the Bureau did not begin immediately upon its establishment. Commons, appointed in March 1904, needed to spend the next five weeks completing a report for the U.S. Bureau of Labor, on which he had been engaged "for three or four years." Then he gave several weeks more to visiting libraries and trade union headquarters in New York, "in order to locate and secure material." He arrived in Madison in June, taught a course in the University summer school, and also used the summer in "examination of the library"—presumably, the libraries of both the Society and the University.[52] He spent some time too at the John Crerar Library, examining the labor materials there. It is apparent that some time during the summer of 1904 the work planned for the Bureau began to undergo a considerable change in scope. According to Ely, "very early in the history of the American Bureau," the following "division of labor" was drawn:

"Ely: (1) External Administration. (2) The 40 Years Preceding the Civil War. (3) History of American Socialism. (4) Great Thought Currents. (5) Final Literary Form.

Commons: (1) Internal Administration. (2) Period Succeeding Civil War. (3) Colonial Period. (4) Organization of Industry and Labor.

Miss Sumner: (1) Public Employment. (2) Political, Legislative and Governmental Features."[53]

It is a puzzling statement, containing phrases which indicate administrative duties, temporal divisions of a subject, and intellectual concerns—and little about the work actually getting underway. What is most puzzling is that the "division" contains no mention of Ulrich B. Phillips.

Phillips, appointed to the Bureau in the spring of 1904, spent that summer in the South, "explor[ing] extensively the documentary material" at several places from Savannah to Washington, and, "in many places secured transcriptions of important documents relating to...all accessible phases of industrial society in the Colonial and Ante-Bellum South." He taught at the University for the fall semester of 1904, and returned in December to the South in continuation of his summer's work. During the second semester of 1904-05, he sought similar material in the printed and manuscript collections of the State Historical Society. By 1906 he had gathered a body of significant material which became volume one of the *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, "Plantation and Frontier in the Old South."[55] Nowhere in the record does it appear that his work was anticipated by Ely.

In any event, by the end of 1904 Commons was convinced that Ely's plan for a "revision" of *The Labor Movement in America* no longer was feasible. The preliminary work had revealed "immense gaps" in the materials available, especially for the years 1830-80.[56] A much larger effort was necessary, and it would be done largely under Commons's direction. He began planning an extended search to fill those gaps. In March 1905 Commons spent two weeks in Chicago, "mainly with the Teamsters."[57] In April he departed Madison on a two month trip to libraries in Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York City, Providence, Boston, Salem, Lynn, and Worcester, and "located important documentary material hitherto unexplored. This revealed the labor movement for the period 1825-70 so completed that I determined, if possible, to reprint large portions of it in advance of the preparation of the history of Industrial Democracy."[58] This determination, reported in the spring of 1906, may have been made as early as the summer of 1905. In 1909 Commons described in more personal terms the revelations of the 1905 journey, for he had discovered a large amount of material "hitherto unknown to any writer of American history even of labor history, [which] threw an entirely new light on our work, especially from 1827-1847. So elated and enthusiastic was I over these discoveries that I determined we should have that material at Madison."[59] Commons knew that getting the materials copied would be expensive, and suspecting that Ely would not approve, he decided to approach the Carnegie Institution.

He was in Boston at this time making a series of lectures to Harvard University and the Twentieth Century Club to earn expenses for the trip.[60] He went over to Worcester to see Colonel Wright, "and laid before him my discoveries, with the request that [he] appropriate $2500 for transcribing on conditions that I would edit and prepare for publication the most valuable selection from the documents...." Wright consented to appropriate $1,500 for copying the documents, but declined to involve the Carnegie Institution in their publication.[61] Back in Madison, Commons informed Ely about the grant, and about the idea of documentary publication. Ely consented, and gave Commons reason to understand that he would provide an additional $1,000 from Bureau funds, and take on the task of finding a publisher.[62] According to Commons: "We then published widely our intention of getting out the documentary volumes."[63] Commons regarded the publicity as the key to their success in collecting materials. None can gainsay that, but the publicity had other effects—perhaps unanticipated. One was that by the spring of 1906 the Bureau was meeting competition from other institutions also searching out labor materials. A second was the sprouting of Ely's suspicions that he was losing control of the Bureau.[64] Now its program was altered irretrievably from his intentions.

For about three years (1905-08) the Bureau was the center of a collecting effort which appears to have been unprecedented in American librarianship. It was funded almost entirely from private sources and the materials were collected by a research group which had no long-term interest in them. Those materials were turned over to another organization, the Historical Society, which was administratively unconnected with other groups involved after their immediate use at the Bureau, and the Society, in turn, appears to have had no interest in the use of the materials. In retrospect, the operation appears to have been part and parcel of the Progressive Movement, a function of the times, and an episode in American academic development. It also represented the uncritical acceptance of the concept of growth in libraries.[65]

In the spring of 1905 the Bureau, for all practical purposes, was composed of four people: John R. Commons, Helen L. Sumner, John B. Andrews, and Ulrich B. Phillips. (Phillips's relationship to the group was one as somewhat of an outsider. Educated as a historian, he was involved in the Bureau's work only with reference to the South, and seems almost to have been its southern agent. Subsequent to the editing of volume one of the *Documentary History*, he accepted appointment to the Tulane University History Department.) From the record, Ely appears to have been involved only tangentially in the Bureau's work, concerned mainly about finances, and only slightly with the collection of materials or the preparation of the *Documentary History*.

After he returned from his eastern trip at the end of May 1905, Commons set the Bureau staff into an intensive collecting effort. Andrews, who came to the Bureau during the 1904-05 academic year, began an extensive correspondence with trade union officials and others who had been active in the labor movement—broadly construed: anarchists, syndicalists, socialists, and others. Sumner began preparations for an intensive search of libraries. She compiled a bibliography in two sections of "rare books and pamphlets" on labor—those available in Madison and those available elsewhere. Eventually it composed about 1800 titles, of which only about one-third were in Madison. She also prepared a finding list of labor newspapers published after 1872 (more than 160 titles) and a bibliography of union constitutions and convention proceedings available at the Society and University libraries. The newspaper list was sent to about 500 libraries, "selected with a view to the probable antiquity of their collections." The staff also prepared files of index cards about particular events, arranged chronologically, as guides to the search of newspaper files.[66]

During this "preliminary activity," Commons was again on a discovery trip in the summer and early fall of 1905. He went to Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Topeka, collecting from the headquarters of national unions "all of the available materials which I could discover."[67] Expenses for the journeys to Kansas City and Topeka were earned by a ten-day series of lectures at the University of Kansas arranged by Ely.[68]

Soon after Commons returned from Kansas, the great collecting adventure began. Commons, Andrews and Sumner, traveling separately, set off for libraries in Detroit, Cleveland, Albany, Boston, New York, Providence, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., and "intermediate points." Each was equipped with a "complete outfit"—whatever that might have included—in addition to the bibliographies and index cards.[69] From November 1905 through January 1906 (with a break at Christmas, one assumes, since they met right after Christmas at the American Economic Association convention in Baltimore). They visited libraries, union headquarters, second-hand bookstores, and labor leaders.[70] They ransacked the files of 68 labor newspapers, and files of numerous newspapers "hostile" to organized labor, concentrating on the years 1825-60.[71] They were unable to see everything they wished as at least one labor paper was unavailable; being at the bottom of "the accumulated stores of fifty years."[72] They made three copies of each item transcribed, "brief notices" onto four by six inch cards and "long articles" onto eight and one-half by eleven inch paper.[73] The copies were verified carefully, "to retain the precise spelling, punctuation and grammar of the original." When appropriate, they visited courts to examine and transcribe the records of labor conspiracy cases prior to 1842, a particular interest of Commons.[74] Labor leaders and their survivors were solicited for their personal recollections and materials.

About the trip Commons wrote: "The results were much beyond my expectations in the quantity and value of research material."[75] All extant files of labor papers published prior to 1837 were examined, and the important material transcribed, as well as "nearly all the files" of labor papers published during 1837-60 and unavailable by loan. The solicitation of materials by Andrews was acclaimed an outstanding success. Also, so many significant leads were uncovered that Andrews made a second collecting trip in the summer of 1906. Six previously unknown labor conspiracy cases were discovered.[76] So much material was obtained that almost overnight Madison became the center for research in the American labor movement of the nineteenth century. All, Commons wrote dryly, was "necessary to the preparation of the *History of Industrial Democracy*."[77]

Ely was persuaded already to further delay in the preparation of the history. During the fall and early winter of 1905-06, he secured from the University regents an appropriation of $3,000 for the publication of five volumes of "original documents on labor and industry in the United States prior to 1869."[78] Upon their return to Madison, Commons, Andrews, and Sumner rapidly set to work at preparing the set for publication. At the end of April 1906, Commons reported the following ready for the press: the volume of Southern materials, collected and edited by Phillips; a volume on "early cases of labor conspiracy," edited by Commons and Professor E.A. Gilmore of the Law School; a volume on "labor conditions of 1812 to 1840," edited by Commons and Sumner.[79] He anticipated publication in 1906-07. Actually it did not occur until 1910, when the ten-volume *Documentary History of American Industrial Society* was issued by the Arthur H. Clark Company of Cleveland.

A variety of factors had contributed to the delay in publication and the expansion of the set. Although neither Ely nor Commons wrote explicitly on the matter, it seems the most important fact was that the collection of materials was not complete. An immense amount of material had been accumulated, but Ely, Commons and their associates had set into action a process which could not be stopped merely by a decision about a publishing schedule. Indeed, the process would disrupt the schedule, and play some part in the disruption of amicable relations between Ely and Commons. For nearly another decade, until its unremarked demise sometime during 1913-18, the American Bureau of Industrial Research would continue as an important factor in the development of labor collections at the State Historical Society, although the Bureau and the Society would slowly reverse position after 1910.[80] The intensity and scope of the efforts until then are documented amply in the correspondence files of Commons, including much by Andrews and Sumner.[81] Ely also continued to be involved somewhat in collecting, especially with regard to contacts he had initiated prior to 1904. His attempts to acquire the collection of Joseph Labadie, for example, extended from 1892-1912.[82]

Carefully organized though they were, the collecting efforts of 1904-06 appear, in retrospect, to have been a matter of opportunistic response to events. Given the reproduction technologies of the time (cumbersome and expensive typewriters and photographic equipment), the burdens of travel and extensive copying by hand make the work seem almost medieval. It was a "crash program," rather than a systematic development of policy and process. The collecting program executed during 1906-10 has a far more modern appearance. It had five principal facets: travel (chiefly by Andrews), solicitation of materials by correspondence, purchase of mate-

rials from dealers' lists, exchange and interlibrary loan, and hired copying of materials which could not be obtained otherwise.

Viewed solely from a technical perspective, the travel by Andrews (and, occasionally, by Commons and Ely) no longer was a necessary element of the collecting process, and Ely was given to complaint about the expense of it. However, technical perspectives may be misleading, and the travel remained essential because it was the best way to humanize the project so as to give the donors of materials some sense of worthy participation in the project. Doubtless, also, the face-to-face contacts made in the travel did much to forestall the effects of developing competition for labor materials. In any event, it is evident that Andrews enjoyed the travel, the meetings with "old war horses" of the labor movement, yarning with them ("their glorious reminiscences"), and the "rummage through barrels and boxes of forgotten lore." It was, he wrote, "no small privilege."[83] Beyond the privilege, of course, was the fact that personal visits to former labor activists often were the only way to establish the existence of other manuscripts and fugitive printed materials. The labor newspapers, constitutions, convention proceedings, and other formal materials suggested only the likelihood of primary sources. As with tales of buried treasure, or the Grail, reality could be found only by exhaustive search. There were as yet no "routine channels" of acquisitions in this field. They were begun in the comings and goings of Andrews.[84]

Often, one visit by Andrews or Commons was enough to secure donations of materials, even to establish a practice of continuing donation. Andrews, for example, visited the headquarters of the Socialist Labor Party in New York City during the summer of 1906. In September, the Party Executive Committee voted to give to either the University or the Historical Society "all printed materials" which might be desired by the Bureau, and to start an archival program by sending "all letters, journals, manuscripts, documents, etc. which may not be required for reference in this office."[85] In many cases the visit was but the start of a lengthy correspondence. The Commons Papers at the Society contain several hundred letters, many of them concerned with the Bureau's collecting program. Many are simply inquiries to confirm the existence of materials, such as Commons's letter to E.A. Davis, Evansville, Indiana, inquiring about a manuscript history of the Bricklayers' Union.[86] A similar example was Commons's letter to the Reverend Peter Roberts, Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania (Roberts wrote on the "labor question"), asking in which library Roberts had seen the *Pottsville Miners Journal*. Roberts's reply (undated, on the bottom of Commons's letter) will be familiar to any who have worked in "the field": the journal was "a rich mine of information" which ought to be "preserved

better than in the dingy loft" where Roberts had seen it. Another familiar note on a letter not in Commons's hand is the comment, "See Blackwelder of Geol. Dept. or see Mr. Smith, Libn. about having English Dept. buy."[87]

The correspondence files also reveal a wealth of incidental information including rewarding and not-so-rewarding experiences. On at least one occasion, Andrews was the instrument for reconnecting old comrades who had drifted apart.[88] On the other hand, John MacIntyre, secretary, United Typothetae of America, found in the Bureau's letterhead display of the union label a cause for excoriation of both Commons (for "moral cowardice...turpitude") and the Bureau.[89] Other correspondents saw opportunities in the Bureau to promote causes not necessarily relevant to its object, but dearer to their own interests. The Reverend E.H. Rogers (1824-1910), Chelsea, Massachusetts, contributed to the Bureau a significant amount of material (some of which Andrews thought to be especially valuable) on the life of Ira Steward (1831-1883).[90] He also began to send, first to Ely and then to Andrews when rebuffed, manuscripts and printed copies of his own works in theology—works he called "boldly original,... even to audacity," in their refutation of the "old, total depravity theologies."[91] As gently as he could, Andrews finally had to tell Rogers to stop, pleading the press of his own work and his incompetence to "express critical judgement" about Rogers's works.[92]

A similarly extensive correspondence occurred with C.L. James, Eau Claire, Wisconsin, resulting in the contribution of a number of unsolicited manuscripts and more in accord with the program of the Bureau. James, a noted Midwestern "anarchist," contributed such works as "The Industrial History of the Chippewa Valley" (20 pages, 1907), "Anarchism" (30 pages, 1907), and "Who Killed McKinley?" (51 pages, 1907).[93]

Finally, in a classical bit of graduate student opportunism, Andrews was able to use his position with the Bureau to his own benefit as a scholar. In the fall or early winter of 1907, he wrote to a number of prominent "anarchists," and asked them to submit their opinions on the subject of "economic competition." Replies were received from at least a dozen of these including C.L. James, Emma Goldman, William Baillie (Boston), Joseph Labadie, and E.H. Rogers. Andrews used the replies as a basis for a paper submitted to Ely's seminar in economics, and presented subsequently to the American Economic Association at its meeting in Madison in 1908.[94]

The use of hired copyists (scribes) as a collecting method dates back at least to the Musiaion in Alexandria, and copyists were a major factor in the

scholarship of many. For example, William Hickling Prescott's histories of Latin America could not have been written had he been unable to secure such services at the archives in Madrid and Seville.[95] In the work of the American Bureau of Industrial Research, one finds what may have been one of the last major instances of such an undertaking. The photostat camera became commercially available in 1906, and subsequent reproduction technologies have reduced the work of hired copyists almost to zero. Probably it is just as well judging from the correspondence between John R. Commons and his sister Clara in New York City, who appears to have been the Bureau's principal copyist. Their letters amount, among other things, to a catalog of the dysfunctions inherent in the process, and there were many.

First among the problems was finding someone competent enough to do such exacting work, and willing to do it for relatively low pay—twenty-five cents an hour in this case.[96] (Clara, in a moment of pique, threatened to charge the Bureau at the rate for a "type-writer.") After copying, the material needed to be verified, and for this the Bureau paid fifteen cents an hour. One document, 66 pages and octavo, required 26 hours for copying and 7 hours for verifying.[97] Owing to the rate paid and the tedium of the work, competent verifiers were even more difficult to obtain than were copyists.[98] Arranging the rental and delivery of typewriters to the libraries in which the copyists worked was inconvenient.[99] Librarians, and their administrative superiors, were sometimes reluctant to give copyists permission to work in their libraries, or to permit the use of a typewriter.[100] Clara Commons worked from notes taken by her brother, Andrews and Sumner, and mistakes in these notes were a source of worry.[101] The purchase of supplies, accounting for time and other business matters were a constant nuisance: "Enclosed is this eternal, perennial account. I don't ever want to see it again."[102] Also, the Bureau, without a full-time business manager, apparently was slow in paying. Clara's observations about late payment were frequent—but Bureau expenditures had to be cleared by Ely.[103]

The cost of travel appears to have been a particular concern to Ely, and Clara traveled extensively: to Philadelphia, Utica, Rochester, Clifton Springs, Albany, and elsewhere. The necessity for travel only highlights the difficulty of hiring persons to do the work. Clara's travel expenses for one trip amounted to $17.67, which would have paid a local copyist for nearly 71 hours of work. (Clara traveled as inexpensively as possible, and she was meticulous in accounting for even the smallest expenses, such as two cents for carfare.) All of which makes it the more curious that Ely and Commons appear to have made no effort to use the good offices of local

librarians to obtain local copyists. Even Helen Sumner was on some occasions pressed into such service.[104]

It is not apparent in the records of the Bureau that the purchase of materials was a routine part of their collecting effort, despite the following statement in Bureau *Leaflet* number four: "Second-hand bookstores have been carefully searched in every city visited by the Bureau staff..., and auction catalogues are carefully and continually watched. Many rare and interesting books and pamphlets have thus been secured."[105] For one example to the contrary, Edwin C. Walker, a New York City rare book dealer, offered four volumes of *Liberty*, for $2.50 each. The letter of offer bears a note in Andrews's hand: "Too expensive for us."[106] Andrews was willing to purchase individual issues to fill gaps at six and eight cents an issue.[107] The Bureau does not appear to have had an acquisitions budget. Rather, it appears to have been the policy of Ely and Commons to buy materials only if necessary, and to consider each proposed purchase ad hoc. Thus, the important collection of Herman Schleuter (editor of the *New Yorker Volkszeitung*) was purchased for $1,500, but the money had to be raised by extraordinary effort. Ely negotiated with the University of Illinois for its purchase of duplicates held by the Bureau.[108]

Sometimes, as illustrated by the Commons-Roberts correspondence, Commons or Ely would try to persuade some agency in the University to buy materials desired for the Bureau.[109] On at least one occasion, the board of regents was the purchasing agent. On 9 April 1907, E.F. Riley, secretary of the regents, became involved in an episode of some comic potential. He sent to Benjamin R. Tucker (a New York City bookseller and publisher of *Liberty*) an order for a "long list" of publications. Enclosed with the order was a copy of the University purchasing regulations (in the form of an off-print from the *Revised Statutes of Wisconsin*), which stated, among other things, that payment would be made only on receipt of the materials accompanied by an invoice in duplicate. Tucker's reply showed little tolerance for bureaucratic ways:

> Permit me to enclose a copy of the Revised Statutes of Benjamin R. Tucker, to the effect that no goods of his shall be delivered to anyone except of receipt of cash in advance...and if I were to make an exception I would least of all make it in favor of the state.

He did suggest that the regents place the order through the Baker and Taylor Company, "who are rigid law worshippers, and would consider it the next thing to atheism to refuse to open an account with the State of Wisconsin."[110] What Riley thought of all this is not recorded. The order was placed through the A.C. McClurg Company, Chicago. (Also, it is not clear, incidentally, whether the materials eventually were turned over to

the University library or the Historical Society. Probably no one involved gave the matter much thought.) For the Bureau, then, purchase of materials was a set of episodes, and not a matter of established routine.

Early in his planning for the Bureau, Ely said he would have the cooperation of the John Crerar Library and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. As events turned out, the Bureau sought, and sometimes obtained, cooperation with a number of libraries, however, it appears to have been somewhat a chancy business. Mention has been made of Clara Commons's difficulties in gaining permission to copy materials in some libraries.[111] One particularly difficult episode was with the Director of the American Institute, New York City: "Mr. American Institute had just had porcupine when I went to see him, and the bristols were out all over him."[112]

Such problems were only a part of the Bureau's relationships with other libraries. Acting on their own, and through the University library and the Historical Society, the Bureau staff borrowed as many materials as they could, so that copying could be done in Madison. In 1905-06 the lending libraries included the Library of Congress, Boston Public Library, University of Pennsylvania Library, Yale University Library, the Working Man's Institute at New Harmony, Indiana (which was, and is, New Harmony's public library), the Vermont State Library, the Oneida (New York) Historical Society, the Delaware Historical Society, and the Kansas Historical Society.[113] Borrowed materials included books, pamphlets and newspapers, with some lenders being remarkably generous. Arthur Dransfield, the Working Man's Institute librarian, wrote in April 1908 to inquire about the *Working Man's Advocate* file, which more than a year earlier had been lent to the Bureau. In his reply, Commons pleaded a variety of causes for the delay in return of the *Advocate*, saying that they would need it until September. Dransfield's response was, "Keep it until you are ready to return it."[114] Contrary records do not appear in the Bureau files.

Borrowing, however, was not as much in the Bureau style as was acquisition and interlibrary exchange was intended to be a significant factor in developing the collections at Madison. Commons and Ely appeared to believe the duplicates they were acquiring would facilitate exchanges.[115] Their desires do not appear to have been achieved, although the records are unclear on this point. Andrews once suggested to Commons that the Lenox Library in New York City might be willing to exchange its file of the rare labor paper, *The Man* (New York, 1834), as it was available also in the Astor Library (soon to be merged with the Lenox, and enhanced through the Tilden Trust, to form the New York Public Library) and the New York Historical Society. The Lenox was not willing to exchange the

paper and subsequently the Society obtained another file through donation.[116] It was Andrews's suggestion also that the Philadelphia Mercantile Library might be amenable to an exchange for its file of the *Mechanic's Free Press* (published in Philadelphia, 1828-31), because it was available in two other libraries in Philadelphia. The Mercantile Library was not interested in the proposed exchange so the "essential material..." in the *Mechanic's Free Press* had to be copied.[117] The workings of exchange never did come up to the hopes expressed for it. Materials long unused in the owning libraries were suddenly acquiring a new value to them, if not a new usefulness.

Beyond the librarians' unwillingness to release materials in their collections, there was also abroad a developing spirit of competition for the materials sought by Ely and Commons. Commons referred to it in 1906, and pressed Ely on the need for continuing a systematic search.[118] Perhaps Ely needed no such reminders. His suspicions of Hollander at Johns Hopkins and the "Yale men" appear to have stemmed, at least in part, from a belief that he was in a race for the completion of a history of labor. He complained about the slow progress in the work.[119] Academic interest in the "labor question" was increasing, for by 1906 the Carnegie Institution had created a section on it within its Department of Economics and Sociology, and Colonel Wright was very interested in the development of the field. At the University of Chicago, Professor Robert Hoxie proposed to spend as much time as he could in the study of "unionism," and thus he wrote to Commons to propose an arrangement for avoiding duplication of work. Commons, who perhaps more than any other economist understood the complexity of the subject, was agreeable.[120] Commons had already made a similar proposal to Hollander, but they had not yet reached an agreement. At Northwestern University, Professor Frederick S. Deibler also was getting involved in the history of labor. There were others. The *Quarterly Journal of Economics* was carrying an increasing number of studies of trade unions. In turn, the quickening interest of academics was creating a new demand for materials. Edwin C. Walker declined to give the Bureau his file of *Liberty*, and cited its "rapidly increasing commercial value."[121] That is, increasing academic interest in labor materials was leading to higher asking prices for them. Although the academics themselves were to be found, for the most part, in the newly created departments of economics (or, as at the University of Wisconsin in the Department of Political Economy), as yet the interests of those scholars were essentially historical rather than theoretical. Thus, their research had to be based on the records of trade union development. The search for those records necessarily involved libraries and librarians, so there were increasing indi-

cations of competition for the records of labor unions, labor leaders and activities in such related fields as socialism and libertarianism.

The word competition may seem to carry too strongly a connotation of conflict, and may be weighted too heavily with images of aggressive professors out to do in their competitors. Nevertheless, it was there. In 1906, Andrews was greatly concerned when some of the collection created by F.A. Sorge of New York City had gone to the New York Public Library. He wanted very much to make sure the rest would come to the Bureau, "the most important collection of labor literature in the country," he told Herman Schleuter, Sorge's executor.[122] Andrews also was much concerned that Schleuter's own collection would eventually come to Madison.[123] Ely was involved in a long-term campaign to acquire the collection of Joseph Labadie, pursuing it for twenty years. By November 1906 Ely was aware that Labadie wanted the University of Michigan to have the collection, and began a flurry of correspondence with him. A letter of 7 November 1906 reflects the intensity of Ely's desire to have the collection at Madison and his sense of competition with Michigan:

> I have been talking with Mr. Andrews about your collection. Would you not be willing to let us have it for $500.00? We should be glad to identify it with you and to give you recognition by putting in a plate inscribed "The Joseph Labadie Collection."
>
> I know that you had in mind to give the collection to Michigan. I must say very frankly that I respect you for your state loyalty. I want to say also that I have a great admiration for Michigan and would be only too glad to improve an opportunity to render a service to that Institution. It would, however, in my opinion, be a mistake to let your collection go there, where it would be comparatively isolated, not forming part of any large collection. So little has been done in the way of collecting material at Michigan that now it is absolutely impossible that they should get a collection covering the entire field. If a student making a thorough historical research should go to Michigan to use your collection, he would still be obliged to come to Wisconsin. It is far better to have the collection centralized, and especially to have it centralized in a place where more work along the line of social movements is being done than anywhere else in the country.
>
> Of course I cannot say that my own position is one of impartiality. I am therefore writing to Professor E.W. Bemis and to Professor Graham Taylor, asking them to express to you their frank opinion....[124]

The pleading was to no avail. The matter hung for five more years, until Labadie offered the collection to the Regents of the University of Michigan, and his friends collected funds to buy the collection for the regents.[125] Labadie explained his decision to Commons:

> I made up my mind it should go where it was most needed—old moss-back Michigan—conservative, reactionary, and positively crass in some things....
>
> I know how well you Wisconsin folk would have done with it, but when you consider what a light it will be to the U. of M., I know your discernment will approve my conduct in the matter.[126]

There was an even more overt instance of competition for labor materials. In November 1907, John Lamb, editor of the Silver City, Idaho, *Nugget*, waylaid a shipment of Idaho newspapers to the Society in an abortive effort to obtain them.[127] Whether it was done for his own profit or for the benefit of the Idaho Historical Society is not clear in the record. The records of the Bureau, however, lead one to speculate that competition for materials seldom reached such a pitch as indicated in the foregoing episodes. Perhaps the reason was that as the search for materials was extended and intensified, those searches seemed to turn up an increasing amount of materials. Commons certainly anticipated such a result. Sometime in 1906 he wrote, in proposing the *Documentary History of American Industrial Society:*

> It will also call attention to investigations of local industrial history which should be made by many students in many localities and published in the form of monographs and articles in order that the ground may be completely covered. It is expected that advanced students in many universities will take up this line of local investigation when the material included in these volumes and furnishing the general background of industrial conditions is placed before them. In this way the researches of the Bureau will be extended far beyond what its own resources will enable it to accomplish, and the material finally brought together will make possible an authoritative history.[128]

The statement appears to be based on a profound belief that the competition for materials ultimately would lead to a greater enrichment of industrial history.

BUREAU—SOCIETY RELATIONS 1904-13

Although the Bureau was established for the collection and investigation of labor materials, Ely and Commons seem to have given little thought to the problems of organizing and preserving the collections beyond their own research interests. From the beginning they assumed the "cooperation" of libraries, without specifying the character or extent of that cooperation. Initially, three libraries were designated as cooperating: the John Crerar in Chicago, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin Library. The John Crerar Library soon disap-

peared from the records of the Bureau, and the University library apparently never figured largely in the Bureau's operations. The Society library became the Bureau's institutional base—so much so that among its staff, the Society library came to be called "our library."[129]

This proprietary note may be indicative of the tenor of the "cooperation" expected from the Society. In any event, from 1904 to 1913 the Bureau and the Society enjoyed a close and peculiar relationship. For more than nine years the Bureau occupied rent-free quarters in the Society building.[130] A "vast mass of printed and manuscript material[s]..." and "highly specialized material...." was collected and turned over to the Society. These had "so marked an effect upon the character and extent of our Library growth," that in 1907, Thwaites felt a need to explain the Bureau to the Society's members.[131] Nevertheless, he made little mention of the concomitant effect on the Society's staff. It is obvious that such a great increase in the acquisition of materials also meant a great increase in the work of preparing accession records, cataloging and labeling. There must have also been a substantial increase in the service load on the staff. The mass of materials arriving also contributed to an increasingly severe shortage of space—in a building which in 1907 was only six years old.[132] Pending the construction of a new stack wing, completed in 1914, the space shortage was alleviated by placing temporary shelving in every place it could be accommodated, by storing up to 75,000 volumes, and by an aggressive program to eliminate duplicates.[133] The 15 librarians in the Society not only absorbed the workload created by the Bureau's operations, but also managed to shift their own activities into new directions, "adding new lines of collection and bringing up those that have for various reasons—chiefly an insufficiency of trained assistants—been allowed in the press of work to lag behind."[134]

Finally, as the Bureau's collecting efforts began to diminish after 1908, the Society staff absorbed the work of continuing to collect labor journals, constitutions, annual reports, other serials, and the increasing numbers of works about the labor movement. One might suspect that prior to 1904 the Society's librarians had been seriously underworked. In fact, only shortly before the advent of the Bureau, they had completely reorganized, classified and recataloged the Society's collections. The arrival of the Bureau appears to have had one special advantage for the Society in that it provided Thwaites with justification for keeping such a relatively large staff.

The Bureau, after all, was established to accomplish a specific task—the preparation of a definitive history of labor in the United States—and Ely and Commons had no intent to continue on an organized basis the collecting programs they began in 1904. Ely, indeed, did not anticipate as exten-

sive a collection effort as Commons put into motion, and consented only reluctantly, if at all.[135] Thus, as early as 1906, the Bureau began to shift the tasks of maintaining the collecting program to the Society. For example, in March 1906, Commons saw in the Library of Congress a duplicate file of the *New York Tribune*. He proposed to Thwaites that the Society offer a duplicate file of *Fincher's Trade Review* in exchange for the *Tribune*. The Library of Congress would not agree for the *Tribune* was too much in demand there.[136] Even so, Ely, and especially Commons, maintained a continuing, but intermittent activity on behalf of the Society, writing to the General Secretary of the Amalgamated Woodworkers to request missing issues of the *International Woodworker*,[137] suggesting additions to the Society's newspaper collection,[138] suggesting purchases,[139] negotiating with likely contributors of significant collections,[140] suggesting possible exchanges with other libraries,[141] and more. From the record of their activities it seems sometimes as if there had been achieved a cooperative, fruitful and harmonious merger of the Bureau and the Society.

The appearance of harmony may be misleading. Beginning in 1908 it is evident by the record that some deterioration of relationships had set in—one which would culminate in the seemingly abrupt departure of the Bureau from the Society in 1913. Unfortunately, the record is seldom explicit about the difficulties between the Bureau and the Society. All parties involved appear to have been behaving at a high level of circumspection. Thus, one must make inferences from nuance, from close interpretation of the record and from the folklore of the Society—not necessarily unreliable sources. Tracing the decline in harmony is also complicated by the apparent fact that many of Thwaites's messages to Commons, and vice versa, were in response to face-to-face conferences of which there is no record.[142] The disruption may be attributed to a number of causes including a growing personal conflict between Ely and Commons;[143] the divergent academic ambitions of both; their extensive involvement in the Progressive Movement (albeit in differing ways); Thwaites's total dedication to the Society; differences in what might be called administrative style (Thwaites believed in the close supervision of subordinates; Commons apparently, in liberal delegation of authority); and, simply, contrary disbursement regulations and procedures in the state government (the Society) and the University. Commons was in a system, especially in the Bureau, which permitted much more "free-wheeling" than was accorded Thwaites.

Thwaites was more generous, perhaps, to the Bureau than may appear to have been prudent. In addition to free quarters in the Society, he permitted the Bureau a liberal use of "express collect" Society shipping labels.

Andrews carried quantities of them on his collecting trips, and it also appears that one was inserted in the back of each copy of *Leaflet* number three, "Labor Leaders and Labor Literature," which was used as a promotional brochure. In any event, the Society began to receive unsolicited express packages without prior notice from anyone.[144] Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, was one who sent such a package—and in this case also had the Society billed for the shipping charges.[145] The repetition of such incidents became an irritant to Thwaites, who in June 1908 complained to Commons: "The difficulty of this is that the box was not sent in our name. For us to certify for expense bills for packages coming in the name of private individuals or another institution, would be considered irregular in the office of the State Auditor."[146] It also appears that Thwaites was not always notified of the arrival of significant collections. In September 1908 he requested of Commons: "In case the Bureau...has made any very important additions to the labor material within the year, will you not kindly send me within the next day or two a brief summary thereof?"[147] Another irritant was the lack of discrimination sometimes apparent in the Bureau's collecting efforts. As one instance, in February 1909, Commons asked Thwaites to acknowledge an "important gift" from Ethelbert Stewart of Chicago. Thwaites replied he was "considerably disappointed" with Stewart's gift, for although 45 items were added to the Society's collections, 74 were duplicates (some had four or five copies) and to Thwaites, it was "a pity to pay expressage on a bundle that is proving so small an accession."[148] It was proving bothersome to Thwaites that he had lost some control over important elements of activities affecting the Society.

Clifford Lord has described Thwaites as energetic, imaginative, dedicated to the Society and to scholarship, an enthusiastic advocate of cooperation among libraries, meticulously methodical in his work, very demanding of colleagues and subordinates, and perhaps passionate in his desire for control over the Society and its work.[149] Perhaps these latter traits brought him early to a realization that in the case of the Bureau cooperation was roosting too close to home. The record is not explicit, but it does make apparent that in Commons the Bureau was controlled by a scholar whose brilliance was combined with an elegant disdain for bureaucratic detail, whose passion for research and knowledge would not be tempered by any great concern for the organization and care of the materials he collected. Although much of the record of the activities of Commons and Thwaites appears to have been lost, there are five correspondence files which reveal much about Commons's (and his associates') indifference to procedural details, and about Thwaites's insistence on their meticulous execution.[150] The files involve the Oneida Historical Society; the *Truth Seeker;* the

Transcontinental Freight Company; the Owyhee, Idaho, *Avalanche;* and C. De rossi of New York City, all in the years 1906-08.

In December 1905, or early January 1906, Thwaites borrowed for the Bureau a volume of the *Mechanics' Press* printed in Utica, New York, 1829-30, from the Oneida Historical Society. It arrived on 16 January, and as neither John Commons nor Helen Sumner were in Madison the volume was placed in the Society's vault to await their return. Its presence must have been forgotten, for on 25 August 1906, Thwaites sent a reminder to Commons. Sometime between September and December the borrowed volume was used and returned. Then, someone from the Bureau notified Thwaites that the Oneida Historical Society had several duplicates of various issues of the *Mechanics' Press,* and asked that he try to obtain them by exchange. Obligingly, Thwaites wrote to the Oneida Historical Society a perfunctory request. Their secretary replied that their holdings included one year of the *Mechanics' Press* and the *Cooperator,* and "no duplicates."[151] Thwaites consulted Andrews, who told him that he had borrowed the Oneida Historical Society file of the *Cooperator,* finding that there was one duplicate of the issue of 22 September 1832 in it, and also that there were several duplicate numbers in the *Mechanics' Press* volume which might be overlooked. Whatever Thwaites might have thought about contradicting the Oneida Historical Society secretary, this time he made an elaborate plea for an exchange, and stressed the "great gratification" which would be felt at both the Bureau and the Society.[152] The Oneida Historical Society did not appear to have been eager to gain that gratification, for no reply is in the file, and the Bureau had to rely on transcriptions made from the borrowed volume.[153]

The *Truth Seeker,* "A journal of free thought and reform," began publication in New York City in 1873. Whether Thwaites was aware of the Bureau's quest for it is not known, but on 13 October 1906 he received a letter from Walter Breen, Glenwood, Iowa (the proprietor of the Glenwood Abstract Company). Breen had borrowed an extensive run of the journal from the *Truth Seeker* publisher, and had been instructed to turn it over to the Society. He was finished with several volumes, and had boxed them for shipment, but he lived "some distance from town," and the press of "an extremely busy season" had delayed their pickup by the express agent. Breen promised early delivery, asking for a little more time to use the rest of the file, "but if you have to have them at once, notify me and I shall not hold them a day."[154] Thwaites sent an untroubled reply that Breen could have "a little more time," along with the request to finish expeditiously his use of the volumes, as there was already some demand for them.[155] Breen responded that 8 volumes were on the way, and "the remaining 14 volumes

will be shipped with very little delay." He was not sending them prepaid he continued as the local express office could not tell him the cost. However, if Thwaites had an understanding with "Editor MacDonald" that Breen should pay the shipping costs, "I shall cheerfully do so if you will advise me as to the damage."[156] On 20 November Thwaites notified Breen the eight volumes had not arrived, and requested that he "put a tracer after them."[157] On 22 November Breen sent Thwaites a bill of lading for the eight volumes, and a report that they had been held in a bookstore for several days. He hoped they were at the Society by now. They were not, but arrived on 6 December. In a cordial acknowledgment, Thwaites noted Breen's statement that he would send the remaining fourteen volumes "with very little delay," and that he could send them collect.[158]

That same day Thwaites notified George MacDonald, editor of the *Truth Seeker*, of the safe arrival of the eight volumes, "which we understand to be presented to this library by you," that he expected the early arrival of fourteen more, and added, "I beg most cordially to thank you for this gift."[159] (The tone of the correspondence makes it apparent Thwaites had not anticipated this matter, but he made no request to MacDonald that the Society be put on the mailing list for the *Truth Seeker*.) Three weeks later Breen wrote again giving notice that about half of the remaining volumes were on their way to the Society, and he hoped the remainder would be sent before Thwaites lost patience.[160] Daisy Beecroft, "Clerk to Superintendent" Thwaites, acknowledged the shipment, with a hope for early delivery of the remainder.[161] Nothing was heard from Breen for another nine months, until mid-September 1907, when Breen wrote that at last he had finished his research and sent off the last volumes of the journal. He advised Thwaites that, "many pieces" had been clipped from the volumes, "but this pilfering did not occur when they were in my charge...." He thanked Thwaites for his patience, and disclosed the nature of his research with an offer of his book, soon to be published—*Free Thought and Agnostic Poetry of England and the United States*. Daisy Beecroft again acknowledged receipt of the shipment, and said the Society would be happy to receive the book. It seems never to have been published.[162]

The Transcontinental Freight Company transaction was particularly exasperating for Thwaites. It began late in July 1907 when the Turner Moving and Storage Company of Denver, notified the Society that a shipment of "household goods" had been sent, and requested that $2.10 be paid to the Transcontinental Freight Company, "otherwise they will have to draw on you for the amount."[163] Thwaites's immediate response was to state that the Society would take the matter under consideration on arrival of the shipment, and requested that Turner tell him who placed the

shipment and "something as to its nature."[164] About the same time the Society received from the Transcontinental Freight Company a form letter indicating that the "household goods" had been sent from Denver on 26 July, and would be in Chicago "in a very few days"; the Society was to remit promptly $2.10, so that when the shipment reached Chicago it could be forwarded without delay.[165] On 30 July, Thwaites replied that he had written to Turner "asking for some particulars," and, "Will take up the matter of payment with you when we hear from them." Shortly thereafter he heard from Turner: they had received the goods, a box of books, from the Denver Express and Transfer Company, and that was all they knew about it.[166] Nothing more happened until 7 August, when Thwaites received from Wayne Ramsay, cashier at the First National Bank of Madison, notice that the Transcontinental Freight Company has "drawn upon you for $1.97" (the cost of shipping the books from Chicago to Madison). The notice contained the printed statement, "If paid, or incorrect, please notify us." Thwaites did at once, sharply: "Until the shipment has been received and we know something more about it than the bare fact that this company notified us that we owe them $2.10 there is nothing to be done in the matter of payment."[167] Thwaites also told Ramsay that he had informed Transcontinental that the Society's accounts were audited by the Wisconsin Secretary of State and paid by the State Treasurer. He had not bothered to tell Ramsay that the Society had no money in the First National Bank, but one assumes Ramsay discovered that.

Thwaites then had second thoughts, and on 9 August sent to Transcontinental the forms necessary for claiming payment, with an apologetic explanation that the Society had to abide by state regulation of the disbursement of funds. Transcontinental responded that the shipment, 85 pounds in weight, went through Chicago on 5 August, and that the company had drawn on the Society for the charges west from Chicago, and: "If same has not been presented to you as yet, please return to us and we will comply with your request."[168] Thwaites replied that if Transcontinental would execute and return the affidavits sent them on the ninth, "we will see that payment is made as promptly as may be." He added that none of the Madison banks had any of the Society's funds, and it would be impossible for them to honor the Transcontinental draft. He regretted "the difficulties in which we seem to have been involved."[169]

He may have suspected their source, and it became clear on receipt of a letter from Andrews to Annie Mae Nunns, assistant superintendent:

> A letter from Professor Commons informs me that you have refused to pay freight charges on a box sent by me from Denver—not knowing the nature of contents. The bill of lading from the R.R. Co. should have

> given you the necessary information—together with the name of shipper. Another box of freight from Cripple Creek, Colorado, was shipped Aug. 5th, by Henry von Phul.

Andrews added the hope that this matter could be adjusted without "great inconvenience," and a postscript: "Kindly mail a dozen Express Collect slips."[170] Thwaites or Nunns informed Andrews that they had not received from the shipper, nor the freight companies, any information about the shipment, but that Commons had told them belatedly that a box of books was on the way. The express labels were sent.[171] The case was not yet closed. On 28 August it was necessary for Thwaites to notify Transcontinental the paperwork was not yet complete; the necessary receipt had not been signed (the state required that vendors sign a receipt for payment, before it was made). He sent a new one, which he asked to be returned quickly, "as we are holding back payment on our August bills, in order to include this one." On 29 August the company returned the signed receipt, with an apology for their misunderstanding of instructions.[172] A $4.00 shipment had made necessary 15 letters, and who knows how much bureaucratic commotion. What was in the box of books is not recorded, nor does there seem to be a record of the shipment from Henry von Phul.

During all the "busy-ness" with the Transcontinental Freight Company, Andrews was starting another acquisitions imbroglio, but it had far more interest to Thwaites, and more value for the Society. On 23 June 1907, Monroe Stevens, De Samar, Idaho, wrote to Andrews. At the Western Federation of Miners Convention at Denver, Stevens had talked to Andrews's "Ag't" (not identified) about Stevens's file of the Owyhee *Avalanche* (the second newspaper established in Idaho (1865) at Silver City, one of the mining camps along the Owyhee River). The agent thought the paper might be wanted at "your Historical Library." Stevens had the entire run of the paper, obtained in satisfaction of a $614.00 judgment against the Avalanche Publishing Company. Many issues were missing from the file, but, "all of them so far as mildew or torn are concerned is in remarkably good condition." Stevens said John Lamb once had told him that in 1904 the Idaho Historical Society offered $500.00 for the papers, if the file were complete or nearly so. However, the Idaho Historical Society was without money to buy them, and would not have any until the legislature met in 1909, "and they are no good to me until money is appropriated....If you can use them I will take $200.00 for them." Stevens offered references: the Owyhee Bank, or the probate judge, or the postmaster at Silver City.[173]

Andrews referred the letter to Thwaites who was in Europe. After his return to Madison early in October, Thwaites wrote to Stevens, and offered $125.00 for the papers, and to pay the shipping costs as well as "all that we

are really justified in offering." He explained, "a weekly newspaper of importance," from as far back as 1850, usually was not worth more than $3.50 per year, and often obtained for no more than $2.00 a year.[174] Stevens kept his disappointment to himself and accepted the offer. He would go to Silver City where the papers were stored, and ship them about the first of November.[175] On 22 November he wrote and reported the papers had been sent "last month," and billed the Society for $126.50, including the charge for shipping them to the railroad. On 2 December he wrote again to Thwaites. At Silver City that day he "learned from the freighter himself" that John Lamb was "holding them for a few days to see if he could not get them of you. Possibly he has written to you. I don't know why they should phone me some time ago, that they had been shipped. One of the men in the barn did it." Stevens apologized for the delay. Thwaites wrote to thank him, and said he would not think of letting anyone else have the Owyhee *Avalanche*.[176]

There followed a six week hiatus, possibly because Stevens was traveling. His correspondence was postmarked De Samar, Silver City and Dewey, Idaho. In any case, on 21 January 1908, the Idaho Northern Railway sent the Society a bill of lading for two boxes (185 pounds) of "second-hand newspapers," received for Gardner Brothers by the Murphy Lumber Company, Murphy, Idaho with $6.75 prepaid, and a balance of $1.10.[177] On 23 January, the Murphy Lumber Company notified Gardner Brothers, Silver City, that: "We have advanced for you" $7.00 in shipping charges, and, "upon receipt of above charges we will ship first chance unless otherwise advised."[178] Four days later Stevens wrote to Thwaites, "I believe now that I have the tangle in shipping the *Avalanche* file, straightened out, I am sorry it took so long." He billed the Society for $133.50, including shipping charges.[179] A month later Stevens was worried still. He had heard nothing since the papers were shipped, and thought it best to inquire, "before it was too late. The forwarding house at Murphy is a little negligent...and it might be that the files are in their warehouse yet." Stevens expected to leave Idaho about 12 March and to be gone for two or three months, and he wanted to get the matter settled before then.[180] It was settled—almost. Even as he wrote, the necessary forms were on their way to him. On their return he advised Thwaites that as there was not a notary public closer than Silver City, he had gone to the justice of the peace at De Samar and executed the affidavit. He asked, "Please hurry this through so I can get away from here the 12th." Then, having learned something of bureaucracy, he told Thwaites payment could be sent to him at Warsaw, Missouri.[181]

The summer of 1907 was not the best time to be doing business with the Bureau or the Society. On 9 June, C. De rossi of New York City, wrote to the Bureau, asking a price for two newspaper files: the *New Yorker Volkszeitung*, 1890-1900 ("in good condition") and 1901-04 ("somewhat damaged by rats"), and a complete file of the Socialist Labor Party's *Daily People* for 1900 to date. Fifty weeks later, someone at the Bureau replied with an apology that his letter had been placed into a catalog drawer and overlooked. The rest of the letter was a somewhat elaborate explanation that the Bureau had little money for the purchase of materials, that its important work had been made possible "largely through the generosity and cooperation of interested parties," and included a request that De rossi state the lowest price he would accept.[182] His answer to that was "if I were in a financially good position I would give the collection...." Circumstances compelled him to ask $30.00 for the newspapers, and the Bureau to pay the shipping costs. If that were "satisfying, please let me know the particulars about the shipping, as I have no knowledge of such matters."[183] That letter was turned over to Thwaites who wrote and accepted the offer with instructions to send the materials by "common freight, collect. Bill by mail, also copy of the way bill." He promised that on receipt of the papers, "we will make arrangements with you for as speedy payment as the usual red tape of state transactions allows."[184]

The caveat did not deter De rossi, and after a short delay made necessary by a search for shipping boxes, he sent to the Society three cartons of newspapers and to Thwaites a way bill, an invoice and a letter. Since his first letter to the Bureau, rats had eaten more of the *Volkszeitung*. To compensate for that, De rossi included in the shipment the 1905 volume of that paper, and the *Daily People* of 1 April through 30 September 1907. He did not include more issues because the papers had not been preserved. "I had no more room to shelve them."[185] On 15 July he wrote in hope that the shipment had arrived in good condition, and requested payment as soon as possible. Thwaites's reply apparently was to the effect that payment could not be made before the shipment arrived at the Society. De rossi responded: "Your postal card received....Of course I expected not a settlement before arrival of the sending. But I thought them arrived since long, as the expressman had told me it would take about a week."[186] On 4 August Thwaites informed De rossi the materials had arrived, and there were substantial differences between what De rossi said had been sent and what was in the shipment. He asked De rossi to search for the missing materials. [187] De rossi's reply is anguished:

> Your letter date Aug. 4 was a surprise to me! I thought to have sent the complete D.P. (July 1900-Sept. 1907), as I had kept the paper in my rooms on a separate shelf since its starting.

I have after arrival of your letter searched for the missing volumes and found the following of them, which had got between other papers and books by an accident no more in my memory: July-Dec. 1900 and Jan.-March 1902. The other missing volumes [listed at this point] should have been in the boxes. I had the volumes not placed into only one, but—I think—in all three of them, partly folded, and there lies probably the mistake. I remark also that one or two of the volumes contain one half instead of one quarter of the annual course, but I remember not which of them.

In regard to the V.Z. I have only found, in the same way, the following copies: March 2-30, July 27-Aug. 23 and Sept. 20-Nov. 14, 1905. Besides the Sunday Edition of *1889*, the only one not damaged by rats.

Of the missing mentioned volumes [listed here] I have found *none*. They should also have been in the boxes.

Please let therefore research once more.

Should this volumes and the eventually missing ones of the D.P. not to be found, then I have not the remotest idea of what has become of them!

In this case there would not be other way as to make a suitable reduction of the bill.

I send the founded volumes (incl. V.Z. 1889 S.E.) to-day by the American Express Co., but I have at present no money to pay the expenses, and will you therefore kindly deduce the amount from the payment.[188]

Thwaites decided to pay the asking price for what had been received, including the materials sent on 8 August. He requested De rossi to send the still missing materials if they were found, and returned the bill for execution of the affidavit and receipt.[189] De rossi promptly sent back the completed paperwork, and reported that after a search of "my whole store of papers and books," he had found none of the missing materials. But he had others which might be of value to the Society. He would select the ones he thought most useful and send them along.[190] Ten days later he wrote again that he had purchased a "few necessaries on credit," including a second-hand overcoat, and was greatly disappointed that payment had not been received. Thwaites had no alternative but to make the usual explanation about the state requirements, and consequent slow payment. One hopes payment was sent in September.[191]

The academic year 1908-09 saw relations between the American Bureau of Industrial Research and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin reach a nadir. In the fall of 1908, Commons came under attack as a "partisan advocate of labor." The attack was more wind than substance, for although it was discussed by the University Board of Regents, there was not a determined effort to have Commons removed from the University.[192] It is possible that in the minds of Commons's critics he and the Bureau were closely identified with the Society.[193] Thwaites appears to have become convinced the Bureau's identification with the Society was too close. He wrote to Commons:

> We should be much better pleased if the present location of the Bureau in the Historical Library Building is not indicated on any of the stationery of the Bureau. It is liable to get us into some trouble in the way of precedents; and possibly also some trouble in the way of political criticism of this use of any part of the building at a time when we are showing the legislature how crowded we are. Is it not sufficient to give the town and state?

Thwaites further requested that Commons no longer use the Society's name or address on the stationery of the American Association for Labor Legislation, stating that he did not want to advertise "the connection of the building with any outside organization."[194] Thus he ignored the precedent established when, in order to get a new building for the Society, Thwaites agreed to let the University library occupy half of it—an arrangement which endured until 1953.[195] Commons consented to the request, asking only that the deletion be delayed until the Bureau exhausted its stock of about 2500 envelopes. He could not resist a riposte: "According to the arrangement now in force, all of the material collected by the Bureau becomes the property of the Library, and the expense on this account amounts as you know to several thousand dollars donated to the Library by this outside organization."[196] Commons wanted more discussion of the issue, but there is no record of it. The letters were written by two men who worked in the same building, about 100 steps and a flight of stairs apart.

One month later, Commons relayed to Thwaites a request from John B. Clark, professor at Columbia University and a member of the Bureau's advisory committee, for Thwaites to solicit membership lists from other historical societies which Clark wanted to use for sending out information about some project of his. Thwaites refused, saying that he did not feel it would be within his dignity and added that because some societies did not want their members solicited that it would be a "breach of faith" for him to use his influence to get the membership lists.[197]

Some of the tensions began to ease when the American Association for Labor Legislation headquarters were moved to New York City in 1909. Other tensions were reduced as Commons and Ely managed to repair their personal relationship, and end the open conflict which had erupted in 1908. In September 1910, Commons gave to the State Historical Society "a large and generous gift of newspapers," and in other ways the Bureau and Society continued cooperation in the development of the latter's collections.[198] By then the American Bureau of Industrial Research was winding down, and sometime late in 1912 or early in 1913, its staff vacated the premises in the Society. A long, significant and perhaps unique relationship was ended. Thwaites saluted it with a letter of gratuitous rebuke to Commons. In cleaning up after the departure of the Bureau, the Society

staff had discovered three scrapbooks and "a considerable collection in our basement" of newspaper clippings, "quite generally heterogeneous," but with "an undertone of labor, socialism, and kindred topics." They were otherwise unidentified, and "virtually worthless....My tendency as a librarian would be to destroy them. Of course it seems a very great pity to have a man spend years of labor in accumulating clippings of this sort and then to find them worthless...because of his failing to take the ordinary precaution" of identifying each item.[199] Who collected the clippings is not known, nor is known what Commons's answer to this letter was. It is a very sour note on which to end a great joint venture.

EPILOGUE

When Commons came to Madison it was Ely's idea that the revised history of labor in America would be ready for publication, in one volume or more, by 1 October 1909.[200] In March 1904, Commons may have believed it feasible to meet that schedule, but by the end of his first research trip in the fall, he knew its improbability. His discovery of the wealth of industrial records, he wrote later, led him to the conclusion that: "I could not proceed immediately to the writing of the final history in order to be able to publish something & show results, because in that case I should have contributed nothing but a rearrangement & possibly a new but doubtful philosophy of what was already known."[201] It is not recorded whether he said as much to Ely, but early in the existence of the Bureau he began to press for a change in plans, and there began the conflict with Ely which was to become increasingly bitter, culminating in a public breach at the home of Thwaites on the evening of 21 January 1909.[202] By then Ely had a laundry list of complaints against Commons. However, two of his statements make it apparent that the ultimate source of the dispute lay in Commons's successful insistence on changing Ely's plans for a revision of *The Labor Movement in America:* "The work has not been done as I had planned. Professor Commons has insisted strenuously that my plans were not feasible and has pursued other plans." Not only did Ely find the insistence strenuous, but also permeated with ingratitude: "He appeared eager to come and it was generally felt by economists that he had here a remarkable opportunity to do original work and make a name for himself such as very few have enjoyed and such an opportunity as has never come to me.[203]

From the available record it is difficult to ascertain the conflict's effect on the work of the Bureau. In January 1909, Ely wrote that the Bureau was in a state of crisis, "and I do not think we can honorably continue without an explanation" of how Commons had used his time and the funds of the

Bureau.[204] Yet, what was now an expressed goal of both was almost at the point of achievement. *The Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, expanded to ten volumes, was in the final stages of preparation for publication. Probably, given Ely's original ambitions for the Bureau, it is significant that in the prospectus for the *Documentary History* Commons, Gilmore, Phillips, Sumner, and Andrews (in that order) were listed as editors and Ely's apparent contribution was only that of writing the preface.[205] In any event, early in 1909 Ely said that for four years he had borne a "great burden," but now that Commons had accused him of dishonesty Ely could keep still no longer. He took his case to President Van Hise, and "consulted other friends."[206] According to Ely, a lawsuit by Commons, on unspecified grounds, appeared to be in prospect; Ely wished their dispute to be kept within the University.[207] Van Hise did intervene, and met with Ely and Commons on 26 January 1909. The differences between Ely and Commons appear to have been aired thoroughly, and a "Memoranda of Agreement" was accepted by them:

Memoranda of agreement reached by Richard T. Ely and John R. Commons, in consultation with Charles R. Van Hise, in accordance with the letter of the two former to the latter, under date of January 26 1909.

1. A general progress report to date of work done by the American Bureau of Industrial Research is to be drawn up by Mr. Commons, if practicable within two weeks, and further, Mr. Commons is to submit a report of work once in three months.
2. It is understood that Mr. Commons will as soon as possible drop the work of secretary of the American Association for Labor Legislation, and as soon as said association appoints a paid secretary.
3. The Documentary History of the American Industrial Society, consisting of ten volumes, being prepared by Mr. Commons, Mr. Eugene A. Gilmore, Mr. Ulrich B. Phillips, Mr. J.B. Andrews, and Miss Helen Sumner, is to be completed without change of personnel.
4. Upon completion of the six volumes which are to be furnished by Mr. Commons, Mr. Andrews and Miss Sumner, so that they are ready for the printer, each is to receive an additional compensation of $500.
5. The copyright of the Documentary History is to be for the benefit of the American Bureau of Industrial Research.
6. It is the opinion of both Dr. Ely and Mr. Commons that the material collected by the American Bureau of Industrial Research, and at present in the State Historical Library Building should become the property of the State Historical Society and of the library of the University of Wisconsin.
7. It is found, as a matter of fact, that the work of the bureau has been carried out somewhat differently from the original plan given in the

contract, but the work done and that proposed to be done are believed to comply with the spirit of the contract, altho the volumes to be published are different from those at first planned.

8. It is to be proposed to the donors that the publication of the ten volumes of documentary history, and the publication of two additional volumes, one by Mr. Ely, which may be a revision or a rewriting or both of labor Movements in America, and one upon Trade Unionism, its Policy, Organization, history, philosophy, Etc., by Mr. Commons, shall be regarded as carrying out the spirit of the contract.
9. The manner of the preparation and the publication of the volumes upon the history of the labor movements, and trade unionisms, is left open for further consideration, including the expense in connection with preparation of same, disposition of royalties, etc.[208]

The document reveals a great deal about the sources of the dispute between Commons and Ely. Its depth and bitterness perhaps is best illuminated by another written agreement, to use President Van Hise as arbiter:

> Personal and Private for President Van Hise,
> J.R. Commons and R.T. Ely Only
>
> For all personal matters between John R. Commons and Richard T. Ely, President Charles R. Van Hise is to act as arbiter. All charges and recriminations made by John R. Commons or Richard T. Ely are withdrawn, and the work proceeds on a basis of mutual trust and confidence. It is agreed by John R. Commons and Richard T. Ely that in the case of misunderstanding of acts and motives, each one will bring to the other, in the spirit of this agreement, his complaint or grievance to be cleared up, and that others shall not be permitted to come between them. If any friction still exists, it is to be referred to President Van Hise as arbiter.
>
> Where charges have been made prejudicial to either one, every attempt shall be made to remove the prejudice that may still exist, so that neither may suffer in character or standing as the result of the controversies connected with the present work.
>
> s/Richard T. Ely
> s/John R. Commons
>
> July 3, 1909[209]

Subsequently, more or less in keeping with the "Memoranda of Agreement," Commons and Ely patched up their relationship, and eventually restored much of their former friendship.[210] Nevertheless, the revision of *The Labor Movement in America* was not written and Ely abandoned his scholarly interests in the history of American labor movements. Nine years later Commons had published the first two volumes of his massive *History of Labor in the United States*. Ely received scant mention in the work.[211]

Paragraph six of the memoranda secured the Society of possession of the materials gathered under the aegis of the Bureau, and, four years later, the Bureau's departure from the Society's building worked to seal the agreement. However, as has been related, Thwaites and the board of curators by 1913 had a decade-long record of acting as though there was never a question of the ultimate disposition of the materials. The Society had accepted the duty entailed in its position to continue the development of the labor collection, as well as to accept the costs of preserving materials received from the Bureau.

Nevertheless, acceptance of the duty was done implicitly, rather than by plan, and was implemented simply by continuation of activities already in process. The librarians of the Society already had reduced to routine (as much as possible) the collecting programs begun by the Bureau, through such devices as serial check-in records, form letters for missing issue requests, establishment of suspense schedules, and other clerical functions.[212] It is apparent that at the Society in 1913, no one was giving much thought to the larger question of collection policy. Thwaites, not yet 60, died unexpectedly on 24 October 1913. During the previous two years, he had been preoccupied with space problems and planning the construction of the new stack wing (opened in 1914). From the record of Society development, one may also make the inference that his administrative manner did not permit other members of the staff to plan for program development, nor even to speculate much about it. During 1908-13 he had abolished the positions of assistant superintendent, librarian and assistant librarian.[213] In the Society under Thwaites's successor, Milo M. Quaife (1914-20), there was considerable turmoil resulting from his efforts to put his own stamp on the development of the Society. The results from that were Quaife's resignation and replacement by Joseph Schaefer (superintendent 1922-41), under whom the Society endured a long period of quiescence, at least in comparison to the rich development under Thwaites.

During the 33 years between the death of Thwaites and Clifford Lord's advent as director of the Society, its librarians continued the collection of published labor materials—master contracts, union constitutions and by-laws, convention proceedings, labor newspapers, and works about the labor movement. The Society accumulated one of the richest of such collections in the United States.[214]

Even so, accumulation is all that happened, because, it appears, no one in the Society was attempting to bring collecting policies and programs into accord with what was happening in other endeavors, specifically, in the labor movement and academic study of it. In other words, the Society

continued, as a matter of principle, the increase of collections without much consideration of such questions as to their use, the need for duplication of collections in other agencies or their relevance to academic research in labor questions. Ely's statement to Joseph Labadie of his desire to have at Madison a collection which would compel every student of labor to come there had been transformed into the Society's policy and program of comprehensive coverage, without recognition of the fact that attainment of Ely's goal was impossible.

After the publication of *The Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, Commons and his associates set out on the "revision of Ely's "sketch." Their work culminated in something else—the monumental, seminal *History of Labor in the United States*.[215] Volumes one and two, published in 1918, were closely based on the records collected at the Society; volumes three and four, published 17 years later, reflect strongly the increasingly ahistorical, theoretical orientation of academic economists, and in the latter volumes the use of the Society's materials is much less evident.[216] On the other hand, in the University of Wisconsin History Department, the *History of Labor in the United States* apparently was accepted as definitive, and there was little inclination to see it as a basis for further study. Commons's hope that *The Documentary History of American Industrial Society* would invigorate local studies of labor development was not working out—in Wisconsin at least.[217] Except for some doctoral dissertations, during 1918-50 the historical study of labor at the University of Wisconsin was moribund.[218]

Its stasis was reflected in the policies and programs of the Society. Even during the Great Depression of 1929-40, and the resultant programs of the Works Progress Administration, the Society did not attempt reorientation of the labor materials collecting program. Not even the great upsurge of organized labor from 1933 to 1941 was exploited by the Society. During the whole three decades the only changes in the program were lapses induced intermittently by retrenchment. During World War II a different sort of academic interest did lead to some resurgence in the Society, but it was in dissemination rather than collection. Professor Selig Perlman (Economics Department, University of Wisconsin, and a Commons student) obtained gifts of $1,000 each from Hyman Wein (Chicago) and David Dubinsky (New York City, president, International Ladies Garment Workers Union), for the microfilming of labor newspapers. It was the beginning of the Society's program in the distribution of labor newspapers on microfilm to other interested agencies at a price close to cost.[219]

In 1946 Clifford Lord came to the Society as director and soon became a great admirer of Thwaites, and set out to remold the Society into an expanded version of what Thwaites had built, with special reference to Thwaites's vigorous eclecticism. One of Lord's efforts was an attempt to reinvent something akin to the American Bureau of Industrial Research, but controlled within the Society. A labor history advisory committee was established, consisting of University of Wisconsin professors Selig Perlman, Edwin E. Witte and Nathan Feinsinger (all distinguished academics, but with no particular reputations as historians), and officials from the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor.[220] Little was accomplished in the committee's first two years, but Lord was able to use the enthusiasm generated by the Statehood Centennial (1948) to marshall support for a program to collect the papers of Wisconsin labor leaders and the records of Wisconsin labor unions; and in 1950 the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor made to the Society a $4,000 grant for two years. It was matched (with Rockefeller Foundation funds) by the University's Committee on Studies in American Civilization; and expressions of support were made by the Wisconsin CIO and the Railroad Brotherhoods.[221] George Haberman, president of the State Federation of Labor, agreed to serve as chairman of the Labor History Project Executive Committee. Roy Zieman, a former teamster and a graduate student from the University, was hired as project director, and an ambitious program was begun. During 1950-53 he acquired from Wisconsin labor organizations more than 40 groups of records, and edited the *Labor History Project News*. Also, he recorded the recollections of several Wisconsin labor leaders, and developed an extensive file of prospective acquisitions.[222] Despite an auspicious beginning, when the grant funds were exhausted they were not renewed, the Wisconsin legislature declined to fund the project, and Zieman left the Society. In the fall of 1953 there was an attempt to replace him by using as collectors the extension division instructors in the University's School for Workers, who traveled widely in the state.[223] The Society's field representatives did continue, as opportunity availed, to develop and follow up on the work begun by Zieman, but their efforts necessarily had to be intermittent rather than sustained. That is, they worked in all the collecting fields covered by the Society, not just in labor. The Labor History Project was defunct. Even so, the Society library, shorn of its manuscript division (through internal reorganization, in 1956) continued the collection of published labor materials, still with little regard for their use, which was not great. The principle of a comprehensive collection remained unchallenged.[224]

In 1964, a different Society director, Leslie H. Fishel, tried a different approach to the revival of interest in the Society's labor collections. The John R. Commons Labor Reference Center, jointly sponsored by the

University and the Society, was established at the Society. It was meant to be "a campus-wide information and collection agency for library materials in the field of labor and industrial relations...."[225] The Society's librarians, still maintaining the programs of collecting published labor materials, were little consulted about the establishment of the Commons Center which was a hybrid agency placed between those librarians and their actual or prospective clientele. Its principal achievement was the publication in 1966 of one mimeographed bibliography entitled "Labor Resources in the Libraries: A List of Selected Recent Acquisitions."[226] Soon afterward the Commons Center was defunct, withered by indifference in the community it was meant to serve. Its demise appeared to make little difference in the Society's policy of comprehensive collection of published labor materials.

Ely's goal—to establish in Madison a center for the study of the "labor question" and a center of such a character that every serious student of labor would need to come there—became impossible. Even as he stated it, the work of Commons and other factors, were stimulating changes in research and librarianship which would make its attainment impossible. Ely appears to have thought a "complete" history of labor could be written; Commons and his students contributed to changes which would make that idea obsolete. The concept of history has been broadened, and new perspectives on it developed. Labor has been developed into a powerful interest group, able to maintain its own research agencies and libraries in which to maintain its own records.

Six decades after the establishment of the American Bureau of Industrial Research the changes to which it contributed were understood inadequately at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin; and thus the establishment of the Commons Center was mostly an exercise in institutional nostalgia. Nevertheless, the record of development at the Society establishes it in the mainstream of American librarianship, insofar as the increase in materials has been identified as growth. That compels a question of broader import: In American librarianship today are the changes earlier in the century understood adequately? Or, do we continue to sail too closely to the intellectual winds of the late nineteenth century?[227]

REFERENCES

1. For the first legislative charter of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, see *Wisconsin Laws of 1853*, chap. 17. For the modern mandate, see *Wisconsin Statutes Annotated*, sec. 44, subchap. 2, "State Historical Society and Local Historical Societies."

2. "Third Biennial Report of the Free Library Commission of Wisconsin, 1899-1900." Madison, Wis.: Democrat Printing Co., 1900. For information about Draper, see Hesseltine,

William B. *Pioneer's Mission: The Story of Lyman C. Draper*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1954. For the best work on Thwaites, see Lord, Clifford L. and Ubbelohde, Carl. *Clio's Servant: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1846-1954*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967.

3. The author was Service Librarian at the State Historical Society between 1953-60, and Acquisitions Librarian 1961-65. The catholicity and comprehensiveness of Draper's and Thwaites's collecting ambitions were strongly felt, for other staff members partook deeply of the tradition.

4. "Third Biennial Report." See also Carstensen, Vernon L. "Adventures in Cooperation." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 34(Winter 1950):95-99; and _____. "A Building is Achieved." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 39(Winter 1955-56):68-72.

5. The latter factor may have been the more important. However, discussion of it has been the least explicit among librarians. See, for example Thwaites, Reuben G. *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at its 46th Annual Meeting Held 8 Dec. 1898*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society, 1898, p. 14, 22-23; and _____. *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at its 49th Annual Meeting Held 12 Dec. 1901*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society, 1902, p. 34.

6. *Dictionary of American Biography*, supp. 3, s.v. "Ely, Richard T." For the autobiography of Ely, see Ely, Richard T. *Ground Under Our Feet*. New York: Macmillan, 1938. For a biography of Ely, see Rader, Benjamin G. *The Academic Mind and Reform*. Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1966.

7. "Reprint of Editorial and Articles Concerning the American Bureau of Industrial Research." American Bureau of Industrial Research Leaflet No. 2. Madison, Wis.: ABIR, 1904, p. 8.

8. Ely, Richard T. *The Labor Movement in America*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1886, p. vi.

9. Fine, Sidney. "The Ely-Labadie Letters." *Michigan History* 36(March 1952):23. Labadie, a poet, radical (the "gentle anarchist") and labor organizer, then was president of the Michigan Federation of Labor. A sketch of his life is also included with the article "Ely-Labadie Letters," pp. 1-4.

10. Bay, J. Christian. *The John Crerar Library, 1895-1944*. Chicago: John Crerar Library, 1945, p. 126.

11. Thwaites, Reuben G. *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at its 50th Annual Meeting Held 11 Dec. 1902*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society, 1903, p. 33.

12. The gifts are recorded each year in the section named "Givers of Books and Pamphlets" of the State Historical Society's *Proceedings* between 1894-1910.

13. Fine, "Ely-Labadie Letters," p. 30.

14. Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 50th Annual Meeting*, p. 33.

15. Ibid., pp. 33-34.

16. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 137; and Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 50th Annual Meeting*, p. 34.

17. Rader, *Academic Mind and Reform*, pp. 165-66.

18. Bay, *John Crerar Library*, p. 126. (Ironically, much of the collection was returned to the Society in 1951, when the Crerar Trustees, in retrenchment, decided to give up the library's social science collections.) See also Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 439.

19. Brough, Kenneth J. *Scholar's Workshop*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953, pp. 23-77. (Brough did not speak directly to the tradition, but it is implicit in the rules governing the use of the libraries, which until the 1870s tended to be severely restrictive, even for faculty.) See also Babb, James T. "The Yale University Library." *Library Trends* 15(Oct. 1966):206-14.

20. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 102-03.

21. Ibid., p. 103.

22. The second library school in the United States opened at the Armour Institute (now the Illinois Institute of Technology), Chicago, in 1893 and was transferred to the University of Illinois at Urbana in 1904.

23. Fine, "Ely-Labadie Letters," p. 30.

24. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 88, 99. See also Casey, Marion. *Charles McCarthy Librarianship and Reform*. Chicago: ALA, 1981, pp. 28-29. (Casey states that when the Wisconsin legislature created the position which became McCarthy's, Frank Hutchins, secretary of the Wisconsin Free Library Commission, asked Thwaites to have the Wisconsin Historical Society take over the proposed work. Thwaites declined, and Hutchins made the same request to the Wisconsin State Law Library, which declined also. Casey's statement is not documented.) Clifford Lord had proposed a somewhat different version of the Legislative Reference Library's origins. See Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 171-72.

25. A third library was also involved—that of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters. Its relatively small collection eventually was absorbed into the University of Wisconsin Library.

26. No specific citation can be made here. The State Historical Society records on such matters are diffused throughout a variety of files and Thwaites, who determined the acquisitions policy for the Society, does not appear to have made a specific statement on the question. Also, the principal body of evidence for the statement, the "orders received" file for 1860 to ca. 1955, has been destroyed.

27. Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 46th Annual Meeting*, pp. 22-23. (It is unfortunate that records of the committee's proceedings were not kept.)

28. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 122-23; and Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 49th Annual Meeting*, pp. 33-34. (The agreement does not reflect adherence to the divisions of the Cutter classification adopted for both libraries about this time. Law, medicine and government publications are not mentioned in the agreement which was with the general library of the University rather than with the University Board of Regents.)

29. During the author's time as Acquisitions Librarian at the State Historical Society, the agreement was a source of continuing low-keyed tension between the staffs of the two libraries. Most of the time it was worked out constructively. But University of Wisconsin librarians, responding primarily to development in their own institution, became increasingly remote from their counterparts in the Society. During this period the Society's acquisitions budget remained at the same dollar amount, so thus, was in a period of relative decline.

30. *Dictionary of American Biography*, supp. 3, s.v. "Commons, John R." A biography of William Walling may also be found, *Dictionary of American Biography*, supp. 3, s.v. "Walling, William G."

31. John R. Commons to Richard T. Ely, 17 March 1902, Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

32. Richard T. Ely to David Kinley, University of Illinois, 20 April 1902, Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid. See also Rader, *Academic Mind and Reform*, p. 167; and Carnegie Institution of Washington. *Yearbook*, no. 3, 1904. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1905, p. 62.

35. Ely to John Commons, 16 June 1903, Ely Papers and Commons Papers.

36. Richard T. Ely to Robert Hunter, 14 Dec. 1903, Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

37. Ely to John Commons, 16 Dec. 1903, Ely Papers and Commons Papers. See also, "Reprint of Editorial and Articles Concerning the American Bureau of Industrial Research," p. 11.

38. Richard T. Ely, "My Relations with Professor John R. Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," 25 Jan. 1909, Richard T. Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison. (This is a report to University of Wisconsin President Charles R. Van Hise.)

39. Ely to John Commons, 22 June 1903, Ely Papers and Commons Papers. See also Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," p. 17.

40. "Sketch of Organization and Statement of Purposes." American Bureau of Industrial Research Leaflet No. 1. Madison, Wis.: ABIR, p. 3.

41. "Reprint of Editorial and Articles," p. 12.

42. A fact not mentioned in the Executive Committee Reports of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, written by Thwaites until 1907.

43. "Sketch of Organization," p. 5.

44. Ibid.

45. Stanley McCormick to Richard T. Ely, 27 Jan. 1904, Richard T. Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

46. Andrews later became secretary of the American Association for Labor Legislation; Phillips became a distinguished historian at Tulane University and Sumner became chief of the Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor.

47. "Reprint of Editorial and Articles," p. 11.

48. Commons, John R., et al., eds. *The Documentary History of American Industrial Society*. Cleveland, Ohio: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1910-11, p. 6.

49. Commons, John R. "Report of John R. Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, American Bureau of Industrial Research papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 17.

50. Fiscal records for the Bureau are woefully inadequate. Macy may have had records adequate for his work, but the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* does not list any collections of Macy papers.

51. Commons, et al., eds., *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, p. 6.

52. Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, p. 14.

53. Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," pp. 20-21.

54. Phillips, Ulrich B. "Report...for the Year Ending May 31, 1905," John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

55. "Report of Work, 1904-06." American Bureau of Industrial Research Leaflet No. 4. Madison, Wis.: ABIR, 7-9.

56. Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, p. 12.

57. Commons, John R. "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1, 1905-March 1, 1906," John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 1.

58. Ibid.

59. Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, pp. 15-16. (Interestingly, the last sentence was lined out by Commons.)

60. Ibid., p. 15. (Commons received $300.00 for the lectures which were arranged by Ely.)

61. Ibid., pp. 17-18.

62. Ibid., p. 19.

63. The wide publication was achieved probably with Andrews, John B. "Labor Leaders and Labor Literature," American Bureau of Industrial Research Leaflet No. 3. Madison, Wis.: ABIR, 1907.

64. Commons, "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1905-March 1906," p. 2.

65. Also, technological developments made the copying methods which were used obsolete.

66. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," pp. 12-15.

67. Commons, "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1905-March 1906."

68. Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, p. 20.

69. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," pp. 14-15.

70. Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, p. 23.

71. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," pp. 16-20.

72. Ibid., p. 5.

73. Ibid., pp. 22-23.

74. Ibid., p. 21.

75. Commons, "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1905-March 1906."

76. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," pp. 11-12.

77. Commons, "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1905-March 1906," p. 2.

78. "Minutes of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin, 16 Jan. 1906," University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wis.

79. Commons, "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1905-March 1906," p. 2.

80. Thwaites, in his Executive Committee Report for 1913 (which was nearly complete at the time of his death on 24 October 1913), did not comment on the departure of the Bureau from the Society. And Commons, in his preface to the *History of Labor in the United States*, barely mentioned the Bureau.

81. John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison (microfilm reel no. 1: correspondence 1894-1911). By 1911 the major part of Commons's correspondence was no longer on Bureau matters.

82. Other factors were involved in the delay of the publication of the *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, such as Commons's publication of numerous articles in the economic journals, his lengthy trip to Britain and his involvement in Progressive Party affairs.

83. Andrews, John B. "Labor Leaders and Labor Literature." American Bureau of Industrial Research Leaflet No. 3. Madison, Wis.: ABIR, 1907, p. 7.

84. Thwaites, Reuben G. "Collection of Material on Labor and Socialism." *State Historical Society of Wisconsin Bulletin of Information*, vol. 36, Dec. 1907. (Offprinted from Thwaites, Reuben G. *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at its 55th Annual Meeting Held 7 Nov. 1907*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society, 1908.)

85. Frank Bohn, national secretary of the Socialist Labor Party, to John R. Commons, 22 Sept. 1906, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison; ibid.; and Commons to Bohn, 28 Sept. 1906, Commons Papers. (However, the Socialist Labor Party wanted to screen the materials before sending them, and to select the person to do the screening. Commons hoped to find at the University of Wisconsin a socialist student acceptable to the Socialist Labor Party.)

86. John R. Commons to E.A. Davis, 22 Jan. 1912, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

87. John R. Commons to Peter Roberts, 14 April 1908, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

88. Thomas Phillips to John B. Andrews, 9 April 1906, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

89. John MacIntyre to John R. Commons, 30 July 1907, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison. (The letter is a two-page, single spaced diatribe against labor unions, union members and Commons.)

90. John B. Andrews to E.H. Rogers, 14 Jan. 1907, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

91. E.H. Rogers's letters, Commons Papers.

92. Andrews to Rogers, 17 Jan. 1907, Commons Papers.

93. They were closely written on five by eight inch paper in a clear, strong hand. An earlier work by C.L. James, "A Vindication of Anarchism," was published serially in the newspaper *Free Society*. (James, C.L. "A Vindication of Anarchism." *Free Society*, March to Sept. 1903, pp. 6-7.)

94. Andrews to C.L. James, 13 Feb. 1908, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

95. Gardiner, C. Harvey, ed. *The Papers of William Hickling Prescott*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

96. Clara E. Commons to John R. Commons, 22 March 1906, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

97. Clara Commons stated that the document contained 35,574 words. Commons Papers.

98. Clara Commons to John Commons, 14 March 1906, Commons Papers.

99. Ibid., 19 April 1906.

100. Ibid., 10 March 1906; and Clara E. Commons to Helen Sumner, 17 April 1906, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

101. Clara Commons to John Commons, 30 March 1906; and _____, 17 April 1906, Commons Papers.

102. Clara Commons to John Commons, 22 March 1906, Commons Papers.

103. John Commons to Clara Commons, 2 Oct. 1907; _____, 15 Oct. 1907,

Commons Papers. See also, "Requisitions," John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, reel 10.

104. John R. Commons to Ely, 4 June 1909, Commons Papers and Ely Papers.

105. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," pp. 10-11.

106. Edwin C. Walker to John B. Andrews, 6 Feb. 1907, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

107. Andrews to Walker, 9 March 1907, Commons Papers. (The magazine *Liberty* was a weekly.)

108. Ely, Richard T. "Additional Statement...in the matter of Professor John R. Commons and the Work of the American Bureau of Industrial Research," 1 April 1909, Richard T. Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison. (This is a response to Commons's "Report of General Progress," written in March of the same year.) For a description of the Schleuter Collection, see "Acquisition of Labor Material." *State Historical Society of Wisconsin Bulletin of Information*, vol. 44, Feb. 1909. Offprint from Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 55th Annual Meeting, 1907*, 1908.)

109. John Commons to Roberts, 14 April 1908, Commons Papers, p. 30.

110. E.F. Riley to Benjamin R. Tucker, 9 April 1907, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison; and Tucker to Riley, 11 April 1907, Commons Papers.

111. Clara Commons to Roberts, 14 April 1908, Commons Papers, p. 33.

112. Clara Commons to Sumner, 17 April 1906, Commons Papers.

113. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," pp. 15-17.

114. John R. Commons to Thomas Dransfield, 20 April 1908, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison; and Dransfield to Commons, 22 April 1908, Commons Papers.

115. "Report of Work, 1904-1906," p. 10.

116. Andrews to John Commons, 20 Nov. 1906, Commons Papers; and Thwaites, "Collection of Material."

117. Andrews to John Commons, 20 Nov. 1906, Commons Papers; and Quaife, Milo, ed. "Collections on Labor and Socialism in the Wisconsin State Historical Library." *State Historical Society of Wisconsin Bulletin of Information* 77(Nov. 1915):6.

118. Commons, "American Bureau of Industrial Research, March 1905-March 1906," p.2.

119. Richard T. Ely to T.S. Adams, Baltimore, 10 Oct. 1908, Richard T. Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison. See also Rader, *Academic Mind and Reform*, p. 169.

120. Robert Hoxie to John R. Commons, 13 Oct. 1906, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison; and Commons to Hoxie, 16 Oct. 1906, Commons Papers.

121. Walker to Andrews, 6 Feb. 1907, Commons Papers.

122. John B. Andrews to Herman Schleuter, 15 Nov. 1906, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

123. Ibid.; and Andrews to John Commons, 15 Nov. 1906, Commons Papers.

124. Fine, "The Ely-Labadie Letters," p. 31.

125. Ibid., p. 4.

126. Ziegler, Robert H., ed. "A Letter from Jo Labadie to John R. Commons." *Labor History* 11(Summer 1970):345-46.

127. Monroe Stevens to Reuben G. Thwaites, 2 Dec. 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

128. Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904-March 1, 1909," draft copy, p. 15.

129. Andrews to Schleuter, 15 Nov. 1906, Commons Papers.

130. The exact date of moving in or out is not known.

131. Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 55th Annual Meeting*, p. 29.

132. Between 1900-10 the State Historical Society library holdings increased from 200,000 titles to more than 331,000. The university library holdings increased from 55,000 to 150,000.

133. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 145-46.

134. Thwaites, *Proceedings of State Historical Society 55th Annual Meeting*, p. 29; and Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 130. The library assistants at the State Historical Society between 1901-07 had a salary scale of $60 per month (Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 30).

135. Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," pp. 5-10, 16-18.

136. Reuben G. Thwaites to John R. Commons, 4 April 1906, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

137. John R. Commons to John G. Meiler, 18 May 1907, John R. Commons Papers, Manuscripts Depts., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

138. John R. Commons to Thwaites, 20 Aug. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

139. Reuben G. Thwaites to Edward Polak, chairman of Manhattan Single Tax Club Literary Committee, undated letter of 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

140. Ely, "Additional Statement in Matter of Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Relations," p. 3.

141. John R. Commons to Thwaites, 13 Oct. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

142. The record contains almost no written messages between Thwaites and Ely in the nominal directors of the American Bureau of Industrial Research.

143. Rader, *Academic Mind and Reform*, pp. 169-70.

144. Frank Bohn to Reuben G. Thwaites, 26 April 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison; and Thwaites to Bohn, 29 April 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

145. Samuel Gompers to Reuben G. Thwaites, 25 May 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

146. Thwaites to John R. Commons, 10 June 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files and Commons Papers.

147. Thwaites to John Commons, 29 Sept. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files and Commons Papers.

148. John R. Commons to Thwaites, 4 Feb. 1909, Thwaites Correspondence Files and Commons Papers; and Thwaites to John R. Commons, 5 Feb. 1909, Thwaites Correspondence Files and Commons Papers.

149. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 56-65, 84-86, 149-50.

150. One of the great ironies in American librarianship has been the librarians' generally poor handling of their own records. The Society staffs between 1854 and 1946 were far from the worst of such offenders, but effective maintenance of Society records did not begin to be developed until the appointment of Jesse Boell as Wisconsin state archivist in 1947.

151. Reuben G. Thwaites to Oneida Historical Society, 28 Jan. 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison; and Dana Bigelow to Thwaites, 31 Jan. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files (emphasis in the original). (See also reference 150. The Oneida Historical Society has no record of this matter because there is no correspondence for this period.)

152. Thwaites to Bigelow, 15 Feb. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

153. Quaife, ed., "Collections on Labor and Socialism," p. 6.

154. Walter Breen to State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 12 Oct. 1906, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

155. Reuben G. Thwaites to Walter Breen, 15 Oct. 1906, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

156. Breen to Thwaites, 26 Oct. 1906, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

157. Thwaites to Breen, 20 Nov. 1906, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

158. Thwaites to Breen, 6 Dec. 1906, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

159. Reuben G. Thwaites to George MacDonald, 6 Dec. 1906, Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

160. Breen to Thwaites, 29 Dec. 1906, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

161. Daisy Beecroft to Walter Breen, 15 Jan. 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

162. Breen to Thwaites, 19 Sept. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files; and Beecroft to Breen, 28 Sept. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files. The book is not at the State Historical Society library, the University of Wisconsin library, nor the Iowa Historical Society. (M.E. Berzins, University of Iowa library to John C. Colson, personal communication, 22 Jan. 1982.) Also, it is not listed in the *National Union Catalog*, pre-1956 imprints.

163. Turner Moving and Storage Company to Wisconsin Historical library, 26 July 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

164. Thwaites to Turner Moving and Storage, 29 July 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

165. Transcontinental Freight Company to Wisconsin Historical Library, 29 July 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

166. Thwaites to Transcontinental Freight, 30 July 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files; and Turner Moving and Storage to Thwaites, 2 Aug. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

167. Reuben G. Thwaites to Wayne Ramsey, 7 Aug. 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

168. Transcontinental Freight to Thwaites, 10 Aug. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

169. Thwaites to Transcontinental Freight, [11] Aug. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

170. John B. Andrews to Annie Mae Nunns, 12 Aug. 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

171. Thwaites [?] to Andrews, 12 Aug. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

172. Transcontinental Freight to Thwaites, 29 Aug. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

173. Monroe Stevens to John B. Andrews, 23 June 1907, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

174. Thwaites to Stevens, 8 Oct. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

175. Stevens to Thwaites, 16 Oct. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

176. Thwaites to Stevens, 7 Dec. 1907, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

177. Idaho Northern Railway Company to Reuben G. Thwaites, bill of lading, Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

178. Murphy Lumber Company to Gardner Brothers. Postcard in Reuben G. Thwaites Correspondence Files, Archives Div., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

179. Stevens to Thwaites, 27 Jan. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

180. Stevens to Thwaites, 28 Feb. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

181. Stevens to Thwaites, 3 March 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files. (DeSamar, Dewey and Silver City are no longer on Idaho maps, nor in the post office *Zip Code Directory*.)

182. American Bureau of Industrial Research to C. De rossi, 28 May 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

183. De rossi to American Bureau of Industrial Research, 1 June 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

184. Thwaites to De rossi, 2 June 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

185. De rossi to Thwaites, 24 June 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files; and ibid., 30 June 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

186. De rossi to Thwaites, 20 July 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

187. Thwaites to De rossi, 4 Aug. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

188. De rossi to Thwaites, 8 Aug. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

189. Thwaites to De rossi, 8 Aug. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files. (Obviously there is an error in the dating of one of these two letters.)

190. De rossi to Thwaites, 13 Aug. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

191. Thwaites to De rossi, 25 Aug. 1908, Thwaites Correspondence Files.

192. In 1894, Ely had come under a remarkably similar attack, and the episode becomes a celebrated case in the American annals of academic freedom. Ely's role in the attack on

Commons is not clear. Within the university he defended Commons (see, for example, Richard T. Ely to Charles R. Van Hise, president of the University of Wisconsin, 9 Oct. 1908, Richard T. Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison). At the same time, Ely was involved in an effort to obtain for Commons an offer of a position from somewhere else—anywhere else (see Richard T. Ely to T.S. Adams, Johns Hopkins University, 10 Oct. 1908, Richard T. Ely Papers, Manuscripts Dept., State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison in which he severely criticized Commons's handling of the Bureau and his teaching at the undergraduate level. At this time the personal conflict between Ely and Commons was about at its peak).

193. The episode is not mentioned in Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*; and is given slight coverage in Rader, *Academic Mind and Reform*.

194. Thwaites to John R. Commons, 11 May 1909, Thwaites Correspondence Files and Commons Papers. (Commons was one of the founders of the American Association for Labor Legislation and its secretary between 1904-07.)

195. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, pp. 101-09; and Carstensen, "Adventures in Cooperation," pp. 95-99.

196. John R. Commons to Thwaites, 13 May 1909, Commons Papers and Thwaites Correspondence Files.

197. Thwaites to John R. Commons, 16 June 1909, Thwaites Correspondence Files and Commons Papers.

198. Ibid., 8 Oct. 1910.

199. Ibid., 8 April 1913.

200. Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," p. 17; and Commons, "Report of Commons, March 1, 1904 to March 1, 1909," draft copy, p. 2.

201. Ibid., pp. 41-42.

202. Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," p. 12.

203. Ibid., p. 1. (Ely's article, "My Relations with Professor Commons...," is an extensive rehearsal of his complaints against Commons, whose "Report of General Progress," April 1909, is a more straightforward account of the work done by himself and the Bureau staff between 1904 and 1909.)

204. Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," p. 19.

205. Commons, et al. *The Documentary History*.

206. Ely, "My Relations with Professor Commons and the American Bureau of Industrial Research," p. 11.

207. Ibid., p. 21.

208. Charles R. Van Hise to Richard T. Ely, 28 Jan. 1909, Van Hise Papers, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison.

209. Van Hise, et al., "Personal and Private for President Van Hise, J.R. Commons, and R.T. Ely," 3 July 1909, Van Hise Papers, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison.

210. Rader, *Academic Mind and Reform*, p. 10.

211. Commons, John R., et al. *History of Labor in the United States, 1896-1932*, 4 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1921-35.

212. Some of those forms were still in use when Colson became acquisitions librarian in 1961. They were real anachronisms, having been developed before the typewriter was in general use at the Society. Acquisition of a monograph serial, for example, required typing three different forms on as many sizes of paper.

213. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 199.

214. That is by reputation among historians. No one ever attempted to measure the collection's quality.

215. Commons, et al., *History of Labor in United States*.

216. Ibid.

217. The statement is not entirely applicable to Commons, who remained historical in his approach to economic theory, if not increasingly doctrinal in outlook. (Seligman, Ben B.

Revolt Against Formalism. Vol. 1, *Main Currents in Modern Economics*. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1971, pp. 165-66.

218. In 1954, the history department chairman, Fred Harvey Harrington, advised Colson that in the department there was little interest in labor history. The university's School of Workers, established in 1939, had some faculty interest in labor history, but it was being developed into a school of industrial relations, with an attendant orientation to labor relations management.

The fact of the dissertations should not be taken as evidence for a continuance of departmental interest in labor history. Selection of a dissertation topic is strongly personalized, in the first place. Also, it is apparent that during 1919 and 1945 there generally occurred in American universities a profound, but subtle, shift in academic attitudes toward the doctoral dissertation. It became less and less significant as a "contribution" and more and more a demonstration of a candidate's fitness for entry into the academic gild. Probably a function of the increasing numbers of doctoral candidates, the dissertation became the academic equivalent of the bar examination for lawyers with the Ph.D. the equivalent of a journeyman's license. The idea is not proven, but Colson has heard many professors who received their degrees between 1919 and 1945 refer to the dissertation in such terms.

219. Smith, Alice E. "The Labor History Collection at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin." *Labor Historian's Bulletin* 4(Winter 1956):2.

220. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 431.

221. Ibid.; and Lord, Clifford L. "Chats with the Editor." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 33(June 1950):386-88.

222. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 431; Lord, "Chats with the Editor," p. 388; and "Accession." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 37(Autumn 1953):64.

223. Lord, and Ubbelohde, *Clio's Servant*, p. 431; and Smith, "Labor History Collection at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin," pp. 2-3.

224. Lord, Clifford L. "Smoke Ring." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 37(Winter 1953-54):74.

225. "Contribution." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 49(Spring 1966):270.

226. "Bibliographical Notes." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 49(Spring 1966):263.

227. Esther, Thelen, first director of the John R. Commons Labor Reference Center, to Colson, personal communication and ibid., personal communication, 24 June [1982].

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE

For information about the development of the collections at the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota, see Mintz, Anita Frantz. "Illuminating the Dark Ages," *Humanities*, 3(June 1982):14-15.

VITA

John Calvin Colson is a consultant in library organization and management, archives/records management and has taught at five American library schools and the College of Librarianship, Wales, from 1965 to date. Prior to this, Mr. Colson worked at the Milwaukee Public Library and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin as services librarian and acquisitions librarian (1953-65). He has been a consultant to the Environmental Sciences Service Administration, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, the U.S. Superintendent of Documents, the National Education Association, county governments, public libraries, and other organizations. He earned his B.A. degree from Ohio University, 1950; M.S. from Western Reserve University, 1951; and his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, Graduate Library School, 1973. His dissertation is titled "The Public Library Movement in Wisconsin, 1836-1900."

Mr. Colson has been chairman of the Professional Education Committee of the National Librarians Association (1979-82). He has also published articles and other works specializing in education for librarianship and the history of libraries and librarianship including: "International Interlibrary Loan Since World War II" (Beta Phi Mu Prize, 1961); "Professional Ideals and Social Realities: Some Questions about the Education of Librarians" (republished in *Library Lit 12-The Best of 1981).* Mr. Colson is presently writing a work on the foundations of librarianship (to be published by the American Library Association), and a study of library associations in nineteenth century Baltimore.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS deal with any aspect of librarianship and consist of papers which are too long or too detailed for publication in a library periodical or which are of specialized or temporary interest. Manuscripts for inclusion in this series are invited and should be sent to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

Papers in this series are issued irregularly, and no more often than monthly. Subscriptions for 1983 may be established for $12.00 per year. At least five papers will be issued annually, beginning with number 158 for 1983. Individual copies of current or back numbers may be ordered (prepaid) for $3.00 each. Send orders to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Make checks payable to University of Illinois.

D.W. Krummel, Editor
James S. Dowling, Associate Editor

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Hugh C. Atkinson
Charles H. Davis
J.L. Divilbiss
Kathleen M. Heim
Lawrence W.S. Auld
Terry L. Weech
Linda C. Smith